



Also by Roger Ellman:

---

*✍ THE ORIGIN AND ITS MEANING*

*ON THE ORIGIN OF THE UNIVERSE  
AND ITS MECHANICS,  
THE MECHANISM AND ORIGIN  
OF INTELLIGENCE,  
AND THE IMPLICATIONS  
FOR THE INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIETY*

---

*✍ GRAVITICS*

*THE PHYSICS OF THE BEHAVIOR AND  
CONTROL OF GRAVITATION*



# ***THE PHILOSOPHIC PRINCIPLES OF RATIONAL BEING***

*ANALYSIS AND UNDERSTANDING OF  
REALITY, TRUTH, GOODNESS, JUSTICE, VIRTUE,  
BEAUTY, HAPPINESS, LOVE, HUMAN NATURE,  
SOCIETY, GOVERNMENT, EDUCATION, DETERMINISM,  
FREE WILL, AND DEATH*

*ROGER ELLMAN*

## Cataloging Data

Ellman, Roger (1932- )

*The Philosophic Principles of Rational Being*

Philosophy on:

Reality - Truth - Goodness - Justice - Virtue - Beauty - Happiness -  
Love - Government - Social Organization - Science and Society -  
Determinism - Free Will - Education – Death

## THE PHILOSOPHIC PRINCIPLES OF RATIONAL BEING

Copyright (c) Roger Ellman 2007

All rights reserved. This book may not be reproduced nor transmitted in any form nor by any means, electronic, mechanical or other including but not limited to photocopying, recording or by any information storage or retrieval system without written permission from the author, except for the inclusion of brief quotations in a review.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 2008900148

Published by: The-Origin Foundation, Inc.,  
320 Gemma Circle  
Santa Rosa, CA 95404, USA  
707-537-0257

<http://www.The-Origin.org>

ISBN 0-9777782-1-5

## CONTENTS

### PHILOSOPHIC FUNDAMENTALS

Preface .....	iv
1. The Philosophic Principles of Rational Being.....	1
2. The Problem of Absolute Truth.....	19
3. The Problem of Absolute Reality .....	22

### HUMAN SOCIETY

4. The Problem of our Biological Heritage .....	29
5. The Problem of our Society – Political Economy.....	36
6. What is Civilization ?.....	43
7. The Evolution to Civilization.....	45
8. On Democracy and the Governmental Organization of Society.....	55
9. On Capitalism versus Socialism.....	85
10. On Science and Society .....	90
11. On Education.....	93

### LIVING AND BEING

12. On Determinism and Free Will.....	99
13. On Being and Non-Being, Life and Death.....	102

### EPILOGUE

The Meaning, The “Point” of It All .....	106
--	-----

\* \* \*

Sections Index of Key Words .....	108
General Index .....	116

## *PREFACE*

### *THE RESPECTIVE ROLES OF SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY*

Science and philosophy are both principal human intellectual pursuits. Both pursue knowledge, understanding of the reality that we experience, in which we exist.

Science pursues that knowledge through an iteration of observational experience and deduced hypothesis to account for the observations, the cycle repeated until satisfaction with the validity of the ultimate hypotheses is achieved or until an insurmountable observational barrier postpones further such research until other developments remove or overcome the barrier. Science is in general fundamentally physics.

Philosophy pursues that knowledge through rationality and logic applied to each issue. That pursuit is fundamentally metaphysics although attention must be paid to reality and common sense.

Science supplies knowledge of the material, physical world and means to control or use it. There being only one material, physical world there can be only one valid science. Science seeks to ultimately develop a consensus with regard to each issue and modern science has achieved many such consensuses. [Of course, later information and developments may overthrow a prior consensus and replace it with a new one.]

Philosophy addresses not the means of the material aspect of life that science treats, but, rather, the ends, the objectives, rules, values for both the material and the abstract aspects of living. Consensus is seldom achieved in philosophy mostly because the issues that it treats are relatively untestable and “hard”, “Euclidean geometry like” proofs can seldom be developed. However, that is an advantage, not a

disadvantage. Non-consensus leads to development of new and broader philosophical ideas, concepts, and theories.

Science helps us to materially exist, and that in increasing comfort and ease.

Philosophy helps us to understand what and how to do with our lives and how to do so in conjunction with our fellow humans and environment.





# 1

## *The Philosophic Principles of Rational Being*

*The past we possess.  
The future lies before us.  
Good, bad, ours to own.*

From the principal early philosophers to address the problems of the philosophic basis of being and life, the ancient Greek philosophers Plato and Aristotle, through the many following centuries in which that original work was reviewed and further developed by philosophers such as Augustine, Boethius, and Aquinas, to the many further subsequent philosophers such as Kant, and their analyses during the 18th to the 20th centuries, a general [but not unanimous] agreement on the fundamentals of reality and living life has developed. That set of concepts is reviewed and summarized [with some editing and additions] as follows.

### *REALITY*

Reality is that which exists, which is. It includes material reality [matter and energy in their various manifestations] and non-material reality [ideas, concepts, feelings, events, *etc.*].

There are skeptics who attempt to contend contrary to this conception, as follows.

- Some contend that there is no reality, that all is an illusion. With them there is no point to further discussion because it will resolve nothing nor produce any useful results. Their contention cannot be absolutely proved nor absolutely refuted; rather, it is a termination of investigation and learning.

- ?There is the skeptic who contends that all is unknowable and that there is no such thing as truth. He refutes himself for if his statement of skepticism is deemed true then it refutes itself and if it is deemed not true then it denies his skepticism.
- ?That skeptic could then contend that his statement that all is unknowable and that there is no such thing as truth applies to all except to that very statement. With him there is no point to further discussion because it will resolve nothing nor produce any useful results. The construct of his contention is inconsistent.

Therefore, reality is as presented above or else all discussion, philosophy, and learning are pointless and cease. Common sense, then, dictates reality.

Reality is objective. There can be no subjective reality. The skeptical objections and their refutation are as follows.

- ?The skeptic who contends that there are different realities for different persons or different situations is misunderstanding through errors in perception or errors in judgment. Objective reality is independent of perception and judgment. It exists in itself.
- ∴ Different persons may experience different personal realities because each experiences a personal sub-set of the comprehensive totality of reality. Reality is "a whole"; what a person experiences is "a part".
- ?Some skeptics acknowledge the independent objective existence of material reality but contend that ideas and concepts exist only by virtue of minds thinking of them and have no independent objective existence. That contention is in error as follows.

If all minds ceased and subsequently new minds arose, those new minds would develop some of the same ideas and concepts that were in the earlier, now ceased, minds *e.g.*: truth, goodness, right and wrong, beauty, *etc.*, and other abstract concepts such as mathematics and logic. If that ceasing of existing minds and the subsequent arising of new minds were to occur many times over, some of the same fundamental ideas and concepts would reappear in each new set of minds. Such ideas and concepts exist in themselves independently of minds to think of them. They have the same objective existence as does material reality. Some of them are, for example: truth, goodness, justice, right and wrong, love, beauty.

## TRUTH

Truth is that which is in agreement with reality. It is objective truth because it corresponds with objective reality. It is absolute truth because there is only one objective reality.

A judgment is a conclusion as to the truth or falsity of a specific statement; that is, a judgment is a conclusion that a specific statement is in agreement with reality [is true] or is not in agreement with reality [is false].

- ?There can be no subjective truth. Apparent subjective truth results from errors in perception of reality or from errors in judgment as to the agreement with reality, or both. There is only one reality.
- ?There can be doubt, questions, or issues with regard to specific truths, the doubt arising from insufficient information or from concern as to the validity of the reasoning to reach the judgment. Those problems do not affect objective reality nor objective truth. They only affect our ability to know the specific truths, an effect that can be

reduced or removed with better information or better reasoning or both.

-?A judgment is conclusively certain if it is impossible for new evidence to change it and its reasoning is beyond criticism. [For example, it is conclusively certain that the sum of the interior angles of a plane triangle is a straight line].

-?Otherwise the judgment is in doubt to the degree that those two conditions are not met. The possible states of doubt range from "nearly" or "practically" certain through certain "so far" or "at this time" or "per a preponderance of the evidence" on to the genuinely doubtful. But, such doubt does not change objective reality nor objective truth -- it only describes the limits of our knowledge of the truth.

## KNOWLEDGE

Knowledge is accumulated truth. There are two sources or methods to obtaining knowledge: information obtained via the senses [empirical, physical knowledge] and conclusions obtained from logical, rational deduction [metaphysical knowledge]. Both are subject to error; however, that defect is not comprehensive.

The senses may be in error some times through unintended or unrecognized distortions in perception or because of error in our comprehension of that which the senses deliver to us, but the senses are not comprehensively, consistently in error. If our senses were not largely reliable it would be impossible for us to successfully exist. Therefore, while we cannot rely absolutely on the senses [empirical, physical information] as a source of knowledge nevertheless the senses are a valuable and largely reliable source of knowledge.

Likewise, in spite of our best efforts, our logical, rational thinking and analyses can be in error through deficiency in the facts available to us upon which the rationality is based or because of defects in the logic that we apply to the problem. But, our logical,

rational thinking is not comprehensively, consistently in error. Again, if our rationality were not largely reliable it would be impossible for us to successfully exist. Therefore, while we cannot rely absolutely on logic and reasoning [metaphysics] as a source of knowledge nevertheless it is a valuable and largely reliable source of knowledge.

Then, what is the key to accurate, valid, reliable knowledge? The pertinent factors bearing on the validity of any truth, any component of knowledge, are: the causality or mechanism involved, non-dependence on unsubstantiated assumptions, and valid relating to all other truths, to the body of validated knowledge. These operate as follows.

- Causality or mechanism is apparent from observation and experience which show that every thing and every event has a cause, and that those causes are themselves the results of precedent causes, and *ad infinitum*. Defining and comprehending the causality or mechanism operating to produce any contended or proposed truth is essential to authenticating or validating that truth.

The candidate truth cannot be deemed valid until its causes and mechanism are analyzed back to an already substantiated operating cause upon which it effectively depends. If that is lacking then it is always possible that a candidate truth will be found not to have a valid precedent operating cause, a valid mechanism in its precedence and, therefore, itself not be valid.

- Assumptions are proposed or contended truths, proposed or contended components of knowledge, that lack sufficient proof or justification to credit them as real truths, as really in agreement with reality. Clearly that infection cannot be part of knowledge without contaminating the whole.

It is not easy to avoid assumptions. Personal prejudices and beliefs may not be apparent to their holder, or they may be

apparent but are nevertheless deemed exceptions to the requirement prohibiting assumptions. That may be because he considers them so important or fundamental as to be beyond question.

Or it may be because he is psycho-emotionally wedded to them, dependent on them. For example, in the history of philosophy the God assumption appears abundantly, major instances being, for example, Augustine, Aquinas and Descartes.

In the sciences, hypotheses that have not [or not yet] succeeded in advancing to the state of completely determined and validated laws nevertheless acquire over time the status of being treated as if completely validated and not subject to questioning. Major modern instances of this are the “Hubble Constant” and its related cosmology and the unresolvable inconsistency of Quantum Mechanics and Einstein’s General Relativity’s treatment of gravitation.

In addition there can also be assumptions that are so embedded in the psyche of the pursuer of knowledge that he is not even aware of their presence and influence on his thinking and research.

- Validly relating to the body of validated knowledge is fundamental to what knowledge is: accumulated truth, assembled agreement with reality, that is agreement with that which is. Overall consistency is a fundamental requirement. A component of knowledge not being so compatible would constitute a contradiction, the holding that a thing and its refutation are simultaneously valid.

If those criteria are met then contributions to knowledge produced physically, that is using the senses, or produced metaphysically, that is using reasoning, or produced using both are reliable validated components of knowledge.

Just as there is only one reality and can be only one reality, so is there and can there be only one knowledge, one overall collection of truths, one system of everything.

[See the next following two sections: 2 - *The Problem of Absolute Truth* and 3 - *The Problem of Absolute Reality*].

### *GOODNESS [THE GOOD]*

Beings capable of making choices have both needs and "wants" [things that they want]. Needs are those things that are essential to the existence and functioning of the being. Wants are things that are desired by the being but that are not needs. [It is possible for beings capable of making choices to want things that are harmful to their existence or their functioning, and to do so through choice or through error in perception or judgment. Such things are generally referred to as "bad"].

The ancient philosophers, and even those up to the present, have identified goodness, or the good, with those things that humans desire. Because humans are fallible and can behave irrationally that definition is adjusted to "good is that which a rational human would, or ought to, desire". However, "ought" is an awkward philosophical concept and "rational" is difficult to define. The definition of "good" based on desire is actually only a guide to identifying good [and not infallibly], not a definition of good.

The better definition of good is:??Good is those things that satisfy a being's needs or that satisfy those wants of a being that are not harmful to the being's existence or functioning [are not bad per the definition of bad just, above]". Goodness resides in those things that are good; they are objectively good. It is not that they are good because they happen to be desired; they are good because of the needs and wants that they satisfy. If they happen to be desired it is because of their having that inherent goodness. [Also, see conditional good, below].



## JUSTICE

For most beings there is not sufficient good to satisfy their needs. That is because if their needs are satisfied they tend to increase their numbers which increases the amount of good needed to satisfy their needs. The result is the natural world's competition for survival.

Sufficiently rational beings develop the concept of civilization, a societal organization of a community with shared tasks, shared contribution toward the production of goods, and shared benefit in receiving distribution of the resulting goods. Because of its efficiencies civilization results in the generation of sufficient goods to meet the needs of all of its society, normally produces goods in excess of that level so that some wants can also be satisfied, and tends somewhat to restrain excessive increase in the number of its members so that the demand for goods necessary to merely satisfy needs does not get out of hand.

The principal threats to that success of a civilized community are war, plague, pestilence, and natural disaster. War is one community's seeking to increase the good available to itself through appropriating by force some or all of the good of another community. Plague reduces a community's ability to supply its needs by reducing the number of its members able to participate in generating goods and by reducing their effectiveness. Pestilence is the destruction of goods needed for a community's survival by beings of another specie consuming them for their own survival. Natural disaster includes events that destroy production of goods or even destroy the entire community such as drought, flood, storm, earthquake and volcano.

Justice can only be present where there is sufficient good to supply the needs of all; that is, justice is only possible in a civilization.

In a civilization there will be persons who contribute to generating the supply of good in proportion to their ability to do so, and persons who are unable to do so [the sick, the disabled, the children and the elderly], and some persons whose conduct is adverse



to the social generating of good or to the functioning of the society in general [criminals]. Justice is the allocation of sufficient good to each member of the society other than the criminal so that his needs are satisfied and the allocation of any remaining good among the members of the society in partial satisfaction of their wants in some proportion to their contribution to the social production of good for the society. The reasons for this are as follows.

- First, the society chooses to meet the needs of the contributors because they are necessary, they are the principal generator of goods; the needs of the sick and disabled because anyone in the community could next fall victim to that state [the policy is that of mutual insurance]; and the needs of the children and the elderly because the children are necessary to the future and to assure the care of the elderly, a state that all members of the society expect eventually to enter. The society may choose to meet some of the needs of those whose conduct is adverse [the criminals] to the extent its members see fit.
- Second, the nature of rational beings, they having evolved from competitive survival of the fittest to the level of civilization, is such that only by the distribution of satisfaction of wants in a fashion that recognizes the relative value of recipients' contributions will society's members be motivated to maximize the generation of social goods and motivated to justly share goods rather than pursue their own good at the expense of others.
- Third, there can never be enough goods to satisfy all wants because as wants become satisfied beings develop new, additional wants. That is, wants are inherently unlimited whereas the means to satisfy wants are inherently limited.

### *KINDS OF GOOD*

- *Absolute and Conditional Goods*

Absolute goods are goods as defined above, those that satisfy a need or that satisfy a want that is not harmful. They are universally good; for example, food, rest, health. Most goods are absolutely good.

Conditional goods are ones that satisfy a want and are good in spite of their being harmful to the being's existence or functioning. For example, death in general is not a good; but death is good for a terminally ill person who wants relief from extreme and otherwise unrelievable pain.

*- Internal and External Goods*

Goods can be analyzed and sub-divided in a number of different ways in addition to the divisions already presented, that of goods that satisfy needs and those that satisfy wants that are not bad, and that of absolute versus conditional goods. The next major distinction is between goods that are external to the being and those that are internal.

External goods are called possessions, they exist outside of the being who has them, *e.g.* food, clothing, money, but not all external goods can be "owned" as for example parents or children. While choice and effort enter into the acquiring of possessions, chance is still a major factor. For example the chance factors of where, when, into what family one was born have a major affect on one's acquisition of possessions.

Internal goods are called perfections and they exist within the being who has them, *e.g.* health, knowledge, skills, but by that is not meant that they are perfect. Something is perfect if it is as near to its best as is possible, but it can still be good even though less than perfect. While there can be an element of chance in the acquiring of perfections, choice is the dominant factor. One must choose to conduct oneself in a fashion that leads to better health, additional knowledge, new skills if one is to acquire those perfections.

Some external goods satisfy needs, for example food; others satisfy wants, for example entertainment. Some internal goods satisfy needs, for example health; others satisfy wants, for example a skill.

In general internal goods are superior to external goods. That is, perfections are part of the being, their acquisition is more under the control of the being and due to the choices of the being, and it is more difficult for the being to lose them or have them taken away. Possessions are lesser goods because they are not part of the being, their acquisition is less under the being's control, and they can be more easily lost or taken away.

Possessions tend to be things that are used up in the process of performing their function or that tend to wear out with use. Perfections, on the other hand, are neither consumed nor worn out; rather they are enhanced by use.

Possessions tend to distract beings from the pursuit of perfections. That is because possessions gratify immediately whereas perfections take time and involve extended personal effort to develop so as to provide gratification. It is possible to have too much of possessions but not of perfections. For example too much food or drink can be unpleasant or even dangerous, but it is not possible to have too much knowledge or health; they can be enjoyed without limit.

#### *- Means and Ends*

Another analysis of goods is into means and ends. Means are goods that one needs or wants because they facilitate or are necessary for the acquiring of other goods. A particular skill might be pursued as a means to acquiring money, the acquisition of money pursued as a means to acquiring food, the food itself being an end to satisfy the need for food. A good that is purely a means is of no value other than for the other goods it is the means to acquiring. For example, money is worthless other than for what it can purchase.

Ends are goods valued completely and simply for themselves. They have no role in acquiring other goods; they simply directly satisfy a need or a want. Many goods are means to some extent and at the same time ends in another sense. For example, having money would tend to relieve anxiety about survival [an end] while at the same time being only the means to acquiring that needed to actually survive.

## VIRTUE

Virtue is directly related to morality and ethics. Morality is the principles or rules of “right conduct” [for which see below]. Ethics is the collection or system of moral principles. Virtue is conformity of one’s life and conduct to moral, ethical principles.

With regard to “right conduct” a rational being's conduct, or behavior, relates in two ways. One is solitary, what the being does relative to itself; how its conduct affects itself. The other is social, how its conduct affects other beings both individually and collectively, with whom it shares existence.

The pursuit of happiness is the pursuit of those goods that satisfy one's needs and wants. “Right conduct” toward oneself is the pursuing, with justice, of one's own happiness to the extent that one is able to do so without harming others' just pursuit of their own happiness. “Right conduct” toward others is the pursuing, with justice, of their happiness to the extent that one is able to do so without harming ones' just pursuit of one's own happiness.

Virtue is that “right conduct”, that right action. A good life is one that virtuously achieves a pleasing state of progress in the pursuit of happiness. Everyone can be virtuous; however, unfortunately, not everyone [perhaps even not very many] can have a good life; that is not everyone can achieve a pleasing state of progress in the pursuit of happiness. Chance, things beyond one's control, can be a large factor affecting one's seeking of a good life.

Lack of virtue, that is conduct contrary to right conduct as described above, that is conduct harmful to others' pursuit of their own happiness, that is conduct adverse to the social generating of good or to the just functioning of the society in generating and distributing good in general, is criminal.

But, why should one be virtuous?? What is the motivation to not be criminal ? That a rational person would wish to pursue his own happiness and would wish to avoid other persons' pursuit of their happiness from harming his own pursuit of happiness is self evident. The question is why should a rational person be concerned about and avoid harming other persons' just pursuit of their own happiness and why should he be in favor of adding his effort to theirs ?

"Fairness", like "ought", is an awkward concept for purely philosophical purposes and cannot be relied on to support virtue. But, rational beings have a sense of fairness, a sense of good or bad, right or wrong ways to treat other beings. In other words they understand that if they treat others in a manner that they, themselves, would resent if so treated, then likely those others will resent receiving that treatment. That understanding by rational beings is the basis underlying the motivations to be virtuous. The motivations to be virtuous are as follows.

- ?The desire for self respect, to be able to approve of oneself.
- ?The desire for the respect of others, to have the approval of others.
- ?Fear of the actions that others might take if they are resentful of the treatment that they receive because of your non-virtuous conduct, resentful of your anti-virtuous behavior.

### *VIRTUE AND SOCIETIES*

Societies, also, can be virtuous or criminal depending on whether they foster the pursuit of happiness of all of their members or of only a select few.

Socialism is virtuous because it generates and distributes good in a just manner. It supports everyone's pursuit of happiness. It contributes to everyone's pursuit of a good life.

Capitalism is criminal because it generates and distributes good in an unjust manner. It supports only the wealthy rulers' pursuit of possessions [which they think will produce their happiness] at the cost of harming the overall pursuit of happiness by everyone else. [So, also, are aristocracies and tyrannies.]

With regard to the possible motivations to be virtuous, criminal societies, or rather those beings who rule and control them, function as follows.

- Self respect is not a problem for them. They believe that they are special and superior to the masses so that they respect and admire themselves and only themselves for their exercise of rule and control over the society even though it is principally for their own benefit.
- Likewise they are not concerned in general about having the respect of others. The only others whose respect they care about, if any at all, is their peers in the ruling clique and that as a matter of self preservation, preservation of their rule-maintaining organization and their position in it.
- However, they do fear the actions that resentful others might take. To deal with that problem they employ a combination of force and propaganda. The force is to instill fear and maintain disciplined control. As a roman emperor said, "Let them hate so long as they fear." The propaganda is to confuse, mislead, and distract the others so that they are unable to recognize the extent to which they have cause for major resentment and are therefore inhibited from acting to bring justice.

*THE BEAUTIFUL*

Beauty, that is the beautiful, is a good that is absolute, not conditional; that is external, not internal; that is an end in itself, not a means to other ends; and that has the following special characteristics.

- Beauty communicates, puts forth or expresses feelings that are abstract rather than logical concepts, feelings that are not, or not as well expressible other than through beauty.
- Beauty is wanted, is valued solely for itself, not for any benefit other than that which results from contemplation of the communication expressed.
- That which beauty expresses is true. We instinctively, automatically recognize it as true, as unarguably valid. It is that about beauty that pleases us most.
- For an expression of feelings to express that trueness the quality of its composition must be superior. It must exhibit those characteristics that we recognize as measures of quality: order, theme and variation, form and rhythm and so forth as well as quality of craftsmanship. In other words, the closer the expression is to perfection the more beautiful it is. We unconsciously measure particular instances of beauty against our conceptions of perfection and are pleased by sensing approximations to that conception.
- In a world that appears to be filled with imperfection and disorder beauty offers the opposite.
- The expressed communication resides in a sensuous medium; that is, a medium that can communicate in a manner consistent with what is being expressed. The medium can be naturally occurring objects, events, or phenomena; or it can be specifically created or crafted objects, phenomena, or occurrences; or a combination of them. Occasionally the sensuous medium might be pure thought, pure idea or concept.



The beautiful satisfies a need or want that we have. It is difficult to contend that beauty is a need, really essential to the functioning and survival of a rational being although some have felt so on occasion. On the other hand beauty certainly is wanted and it is a want that is not harmful to beings' functioning and survival.

The beautiful is always true; however, the true is not necessarily beautiful. There are ugly truths. That is, some of reality, some of that which is, is ugly. One might propose that beauty is the highest form of truth just as compassion is the highest form of love and equity is the highest form of justice.

One can also observe that art is created beauty [if it is not beautiful it cannot be art] and an artist is one who creates beauty [if his creation lacks beauty he has failed as an artist].

## HAPPINESS

A good that is purely an end in itself and not at all a means is called a higher good [as compared to lesser goods, those that are partially or totally means]. It is not the greatest good. There are many higher goods, many goods that are pure ends and not at all means. In general a higher good is more valuable, more desirable, than a lesser good because a higher good consists completely of something needed or wanted. A good that is purely a means provides nothing that is directly needed or wanted, satisfies no end; it only provides a means which if employed will lead to obtaining an end, a higher good.

The greatest good, *summum bonum*, for a rational being would be its having:

- [1] The highest good of each of the satisfactions of all of its needs  
[to survive and function],
- [2] And of all wanted perfections  
[that it chooses to pursue],



- [3] And a personal comfortable amount of wanted possessions  
[neither so much nor so little as to distract from perfections].

Happiness is virtuously having that greatest good, that *summum bonum*. It can be pursued, but it can never be completely achieved; however, its pursuit with progress toward it can be an approximation or partial enjoyment of pure happiness.

Happiness depends upon Virtue and Virtue depends upon Justice.

## LOVE

It is a curious thing, that love needs to be explained. We all want love and, seemingly, have a clear idea of what we mean by that. Yet, misconceptions of love abound, and, still more of a problem, most persons seem not to know how to give love, seem not to know what loving is.

Love is wishing good for the object of your love and acting to bestow that good. The feeling of love is the wishing. Being loving is the acting to bestow.

When a person says "I love candy" they do not mean that they wish well for the candy. They do not even care about the candy's welfare. What they mean is that they want to possess the candy, they want to satisfy and gratify themselves with the candy (in this case at the expense of the candy inasmuch as it becomes destroyed in being eaten).

More frequently than not when a lover says to his beloved, "I love you !" he does not mean that he wishes her welfare. No, he means that he wants to possess her, to continually experience the pleasure and gratification of her for himself.

Those are not love. None of us in wishing to be loved wishes to be owned, possessed, used in such a fashion. Then, where did the concept of what we really want come from ?

It came from childhood, from infancy. When we were very young we received true love from our parents. They wished and acted with regard to us only in the interest of our welfare. They fed, clothed, nurtured, caressed, and cared for us in every way. It felt very good.

While we do not wish to return to the helplessness and dependence of that past state we do wish to continue in being loved in that way. That is what love is. Giving that to others is loving. Receiving that is being loved. It is not a clinging, smothering, restricting thing. True loving seeks the fulfillment of the person loved.

Love does not require sacrificing oneself. One must be able to, and one must succeed at, loving oneself. If one cannot really love the person that they are closest to, themselves, then they certainly cannot validly love others.

Love and being loving are the condition and acts of sound, integrated persons. They are acting in their own welfare and, because love is something that can be, that is, infinite, that is without limit, they have abundant love remaining to give to others. They are able in abundance to wish the welfare of others and to reasonably act in that direction.

Social love is a society based on love -- based on each member wishing and behaving to implement the welfare of the others, of all. Social love is the virtuous society.

*The past – harvest done,  
The future waits for planting.  
What crop will we grow ?*

## 2

### *The Problem of Absolute Truth*

In general, a statement and its contradiction, whether a contradiction that is comprehensive or partial, cannot be simultaneously true. Therefore, there are some absolute truths.

Different persons may experience different personal realities because each experiences a personal sub-set of the comprehensive totality of reality. But, there is only one objective reality.

Truth is that which is in agreement with reality. It is objective truth because it corresponds with objective reality. It is absolute truth because there is only one objective reality.

Thus there is absolute truth, the collective body of absolute truths.

Not all statements are absolute truths. Aside from error, which by definition is not true, there is opinion. For example:

- Some people state their liking for candy; some their dislike. It is a matter of opinion.
- But, the statement "Some candy has properties that appeal to some people" is an absolute truth.

The point of view that the questions, "What is truth?" and "What is real?" are meaningless questions without answers is not only incorrect but quite negative and harmful in that it suppresses inquiry and progress that could otherwise take place.

Truth is that which conforms to and describes reality. Reality is that which is, not only matter and energy in their various forms but also: feelings and emotions, ideas and cultures, languages and arts,

and so forth. **Whether we can know, sense, measure, or understand some aspect of reality or not it still, nevertheless, is.** Its being does not depend on our consent, nor our observation, nor our understanding of it, nor even our own being. We are not gods.

The problem is not whether there is absolute truth or not -- there is. The problem is finding out, coming to know, what the absolute truth is, what is true and what is not. Just what is the "real" reality.

This problem, the difficulty in determining the truth about reality, has beset mankind since the earliest stages of the development of our reasoning. That difficulty -- many have deemed it an impossibility and still do -- has resulted in a more or less collective decision to grant equal validity to a number of different versions of the truth in spite of their being mutually contradictory.

Not that individuals, organizations (e.g. religions, businesses, academia) and governments hold the opinion that their own version of the truth is not correct. Rather, they ardently believe in the correctness of their own views. But, their inability to prove their views and their inability to defeat differing or opposing views necessitates their getting along in some fashion with those other views and the multiplicity of contradictory views of reality.

That state of affairs has existed for so many human lifetimes that it has essentially implanted in our collective and individual thinking the incorrect belief that there is no absolute truth, that truth is what we say it is -- especially that truth is what we can enforce it to be.

We have gone from inability to determine the truth to non-belief in its existence and then to belief that truth, and reality, are whatever we believe them to be and can force our fellow (or organization or government) to accept. The most significant characteristic of the 20th Century, other than its explosion of technology, has been its adoption of the attitude that truth is different

for each person and each case, that it is what each individual perceives it to be -- that there is no objective reality, only the subjective reality as perceived by each individual -- that all is relative.

The great damage that such thinking does is the license that it gives. It gives license to create, choose, decide upon one's own "reality" and then act accordingly. Such thinking ultimately gives us war, rapine, holocausts.

But, if there is an objective reality, objective truth, then, even if we are not able to completely know and understand it, we are subject to it. We are measured and judged by it; we experience the effects and consequences of it whether we agree and approve or not, and we are compelled to behave accordingly.

*Thus objective reality and objective truth,  
which indeed exist,  
also are desirable and beneficial.*

*They are, in fact, essential to civilized society.*

### 3

## *The Problem of Absolute Reality*

How can the truth be found? How can we determine what is the objective reality, what is the absolute truth?

By starting at the beginning, having first eliminated all pre-conceived ideas, then relying only on unchallengeable postulates and sound logic, testing the results for conformity with observation and experience. That is the only course available to us. It is also a course that cannot fail if rigorously pursued.

There is only one postulate needed, and it is the only one available: An infinity is impossible in material reality. The reason for this is that the existence of any real infinity results in contradictions. The contradictions (e.g. the irresistible force encounters the immovable object) are impossible therefore infinity is impossible, except as a non-material theoretical concept.

A corollary to this is: Conservation must be maintained. The inputs and outputs, the amounts at the start, any intermediate stages, and the finish must reconcile. There can be no overall loss nor gain, no something from nothing (nor nothing from something).

To account for existence it is necessary to show why it is as compared to the alternative, nothing. Thus one must begin at the beginning, "nothing". The starting point is absolute nothing -- the state before there was anything, before everything. It is the only state that requires no explanation nor accounting for its existence. It is naturally what one would expect before anything started.

But, starting from *nothing* and maintaining conservation would appear to preclude any further progress, any universe at all. Yet, paraphrasing Descartes, "I (part of the universe) think, therefore the universe is."

The resolution of this dilemma is simple and leads directly to the proven physics of our contemporary universe:

The primal *nothing* changed into *something* and a conservation-maintaining equal-but-opposite *un-something*.

That initial event was so unstable that it exploded too immediately for the two opposites to recombine and cancel. That explosion was an immense shower of matter particles and energy now referred to as the "big bang".

The development from that event, a logical and mathematical derivation of all of the fundamental laws of physics (Coulomb's Law, Ampere's Law, Newton's Laws of Motion, Newton's Law of Gravitation, relativity, radiation, fields, photons, atomic structure, nuclear structure, ..., all of the physics of the contemporary universe) shows that our universe is the joint operation of the *something* and the *un-something*, which together result in the universe's fundamental particles.

Thus was the origin of the universe.

### *THE PROBLEM OF EFFICIENT CAUSE (THAT WHICH CAUSED IT TO HAPPEN)*

Observation and experience teach that everything has a cause, and logic dictates that nothing happens without some reason, some cause. Over two millennia ago Plato addressed and Aristotle elaborated the phenomenon of cause and the problem of the origin of the universe. In order to avoid an infinite string of prior causes, with no actual beginning, Plato concluded that the beginning had to be something that was its own cause.

And, if something is its own cause then it must have always existed and never had a beginning.

From that time on all of the monotheistic religions and philosophies that address the problem of origin have accepted Plato's

concept that the beginning was something that was its own cause, that something being deemed some form of infinite, omnipotent creator God.

But, for something to cause itself an insuperable dilemma must be overcome:

- The something must exist in order to cause itself,  
and
- It must cause itself in order to exist.

For something to be a cause does not require that it occur or exist before the thing caused in the time sense. However, it does require precedence of the cause-er in the sense of being an extant condition that is independent of the state of the cause-ee.

There is no way to overcome the dilemma that something cannot be its own cause. Consequently, this problem has always been ignored or deemed an "unknowable mystery of God", which actually is merely an avoiding or ignoring of the problem.

But, if the beginning cannot be a self-caused something it must be an un-caused something -- what could that be? What it could be, what it is, is whatever the postulating of a self-caused beginning was trying to avoid. Without Plato's self-caused beginning there is no beginning at all; there is only simply *nothing*.

That, absolute *nothing*, is the un-caused beginning,  
or if one prefers, the self-caused beginning.

### *THE PROBLEM OF FORMAL CAUSE AND MATERIAL CAUSE (THAT WHICH DETERMINED ITS CHARACTERISTICS)*

Aristotle recognized that the cause of something is not merely the initiating action (referred to as the efficient cause) but also the source of the nature and characteristics (called the formal cause) and the substance (called the material cause) of that which is caused.



The experienced universe having a tremendous variety of forms, natures, and characteristics, it was necessary for Aristotle (and for the religions that adapted Plato's and Aristotle's concepts of God - - Judaism, Christianity, and Islam) to deem his self-caused first cause as being infinite in all characteristics. That is, in order to be the formal cause of all, the self-caused first cause must be the perfection, the maximum of all. It must contain every form and substance and those to the ultimate.

That creates a problem that would appear to mean that *nothing* cannot be the un-caused first cause, a problem that appears to be insuperable: *nothing* would appear to have no form nor substance at all and thus to be completely incapable of being the formal cause and the material cause of all else.

However, just the opposite is the case. *Nothing* is the only "thing" capable of being the formal and material cause of an unlimited variety of forms, natures, characteristics and substances.

- *Nothing* can be divided into *anything* and an equal-except-opposite *un-anything*.
- Its perfect "nothingness" makes it more perfectly able to divide into a limitless variety of forms and their opposites than would any other thing.
- *Nothing* contains within itself every possible, every conceivable form.
- It does so without getting involved in the problem of infinity, a concept incapable of meaning in reality.

The Platonic (and religious) self-caused first cause requires that, as formal cause and material cause, it contain and be an infinity of forms, natures, characteristics, and substances each realized to

infinite degree. The actual first cause, *nothing*, involves no infinities at all yet it exceeds the performance of that of Plato and Aristotle:

- It is able to exist, unlike that of Plato and Aristotle, and
- It does not require infinity, which is not really possible (not even for a God).

The origin of all, the First Cause, was the primal *nothing*, that which seems natural as the alternative to any existence, that which seems natural as what was the state prior to the beginning of the universe.

That the origin of the universe was as just described has been comprehensively validated. From the same premises that lead to the described origin, the mechanics, the physics, of the world and the universe that we know today have all been derived and developed. All of the heretofore empirical laws of physics (that is laws deduced from observation of behavior) have been placed on the much more fundamental basis of derived theorems, similar to the development of Euclidean Geometry. Such a derivation and development is much too massive for this brief paper, but it exists and is valid. [See the book, "The Origin and Its Meaning" or see <http://www.The-Origin.org> .

But, why did the initial event happen, why did the universe begin? It would seem much more reasonable that an original primal *nothing* simply remain that way, simply continue being just *nothing* forever.

### *THE PROBLEM OF WHY THE ORIGIN OCCURRED*

It turns out, startling as it may seem, that the primal *absolute nothing*, the "existence" of which is unavoidable at the beginning, inevitably must give rise to something else. Some change, "sometime", had to happen to the primal *absolute nothing*. The reason has to do with time, duration, and the impossibility of infinity.

A *change* is one set of conditions being replaced by some different set of conditions. The direction of the change is inherent in the definition: the *replacing* set comes after the *replaced* set.

*Duration* is that which is until the next change. Our human experience is that durations begin and end with change; however, for a duration to be it is only necessary that its terminating change has not occurred. A *duration* need not be measurable. Measurement is merely the comparison of something against a defined standard quantity with the drawing of a conclusion as to the relative amounts of the two.

*Time* in the abstract is the potentiality or capability to exhibit duration. *Time* is latent *duration* so to speak. Realized time, the actualization instead of latency, is the exhibiting of duration.

Before the start of the universe, when only the primal *absolute nothing* was, there was no change. A *duration* was in process. A change was required to prevent that duration from being infinite by providing a termination of that primal duration. (Time was realized, therefore, even before the start of the universe. Although it was unmeasurable, a duration was going on. Time has always been realized. The origin of the universe made time become measurable.)

It is now possible to present two causes for the origin of the universe happening, causes for the universe to arise from *absolute nothing*, causes for that arising being inevitable. These two causes can be viewed as two different points of view of one cause, the impossibility of infinity. Their statement is as follows.

First

The original *absolute nothing* was, naturally, finite; but, were it to "exist" "forever", that would constitute an infinity, an infinite duration, which is impossible. Even *nothing* cannot have infinite duration; the "zeroness" of nothing does not avoid the "infiniteness" of forever. Therefore there had to be an

interruption of the original *nothing's* duration, which interruption was the origin of the universe.

#### Second

In an infinite duration the opportunity or possibility of a change, even a change in absolute nothing, is a certainty (mathematical probability of  $1.0$ ). Put another way, in an infinite duration even an infinitesimally small probability of some change operates on so much (infinite) opportunity that the probabilistic expectation of an interruption of some kind is a certainty. Such was the origin of the universe from the primal *absolute nothing*.

In a sense, the first of these statements is explanation of why it happened and the second is of how, namely a chance event. We need not be disturbed by our universe's existence being a rare and random chance occurrence. After all, the universe does exist and it was inevitable.

## 4

# *The Problem of Our Biological Heritage*

In order to understand the implications of reality for us individually, that is as individual persons, we need to understand our nature, "where we come from" and the factors that condition our behavior and expectations.

### *OUR BIOLOGICAL HERITAGE*

All biologically evolved life, that is all presently existing life, is various forms of competitors, combatants, fighters in a life and death, "no holds barred" struggle for survival. The battlefield is deep with the remains of the vanquished and the remorseless contest continues this very day and utterly without mercy.

This is not because of some heavenly, nor natural, mandate nor are the contestants, whether the vanquished or the victors, mean, evil or otherwise to be condemned for their behavior. They are merely natural. They are merely behaving naturally.

Change pervades nature; everything that exists constantly changes, and change constantly produces new variations, new types of natural beings with modified characteristics. In most cases the changes prove not to be advantageous and the individual having them fails to survive. But, sometimes a change appears that is a significant enough advantage that the individuals having that change are able to out-compete, to out-survive their fellows.

All life forms depend on a supply of certain sustaining conditions and materials from their environment: appropriate temperature, light, air, water, food or whatever, specific to the life form. If the supply of those necessities is abundant the life form increases in size or number until the supply becomes no longer sufficient to maintain that increased size or number. When the supply is not sufficient then those individuals most adept at securing enough

to meet their needs survive. The others tend to fail, to be eliminated, to die out.

Life forms tend to reproduce their characteristics in their offspring. The types that better survive the competition for individual survival because of their having more advantageous characteristics are more likely to populate the next generation than the types that cannot as successfully compete, that cannot obtain enough to maintain their own life let alone reproduce it. The next generation will, then, tend to have a greater proportion of individuals having those advantageous characteristics. Inevitably the process selects and improves the characteristics of those life forms that are most successful at acquiring from the environment that which they need and at reproducing in their offspring those same improved characteristics.

And we humans stand at the end of a very long chain of this process. We are refined and re-refined champion pursuers of our own self interest as we perceive it – personal welfare and survival. We reproduce those same characteristics in our offspring.

The more advanced life forms, the higher animals, can learn from experience to some extent, but it apparently requires a mental level only reached by we humans (at least in our planet's environment) to reason abstractly and to apply that process to learning. Thus we humans have learned to benefit from the longer term effects of adhering to short term constraints. This has led to a decreased tendency to murder, steal, and so forth, acts which might produce immediate instantaneous increase in short term personal survival and material welfare but which bode poorly for the long term because of the danger, and even likelihood, of being victim rather than perpetrator.

There are two different potential modes of application by humans of their relatively new characteristic of intelligence. These are illustrated in the table below.

#### SECTION 4 - THE PROBLEM OF OUR BIOLOGICAL HERITAGE

##### Uses of Rising Intelligence and Knowledge

<u>Natural</u>	<u>Rational</u>
Increased competition for limited resources.	Cooperation increasing resources for everyone.
Less security due to preying on each other.	More security because of helping each other.
Exploitations: slavery, autocracy, oligarchy.	Freedom and control over one's own life.
Relatively slow progress in environmental control and the quality of life.	Enhanced development of environmental control and the quality of life.
Enslavement because of the stressed existence.	Freedom to be and to achieve one's potential.

*Table 1*

Because of our natural heritage we tend to take the left path above, that of greater competition. It is natural and instinctive to us. That path, largely with us to this day, can produce a high quality of life and survival for only a small group of the most successful competitors. It produces misery for the majority of society and it wastes resources and inhibits overall progress.

Yet, this is man, behaving according to his nature, his natural heritage. Why should we expect otherwise ?

Actually, many men throughout the ages of human existence have expected otherwise. Human history is replete with attempts to alter human nature, or at least to alter human behavior in spite of human nature.

Government is the greatest single instance. Long before the evolution of human intelligence our biological forebears learned the benefit of pack, herd, pride, tribal or whatever social organization to provide protection from predators and facilitate the gathering or



hunting of food. Any organization like those involves leaders and rules. In sophisticated societies those are called government.

While government still functions primarily in terms of improving the supply of the material necessities and protection of the social organization and its members, it also pursues, and achieves to some extent, the altering of the natural behavior of the members of society. Excessive intra-societal competition is restrained by law and developed custom, both backed up by punishment for violations.

Government does not move man from the competitive branch of progress to the cooperative one (of the above Table 1), nor does it seek to. In practice, the leaders in any society are the most successful competitors. They enjoy the high quality of life that their competitive success produces. They certainly do not want to change those "rules of the game". The modification of human behavior that government imposes is only to the extent and for the purpose of maintaining the government's structure and the position and quality of life of the leaders. That, quite naturally, is the leaders' primary interest.

Government does not really address man's nature, only his practical behavior. Religion, on the other hand, attempts to modify not only the behavior of man but also the nature of man. Religion attempts to overcome our inherited nature and overlay it with a "good" nature (to varying degrees in various religions). The tools that religion uses are generally the same as those of government: laws, education and punishment. In the case of religion the punishment (an unfavorable next life) is less tangible and less immediate than that of a government (unpleasant circumstances now, in this life). On the other hand, in religion the new feature of reward for good behavior (a favorable next life -- also not tangible or immediate) is used as an additional incentive.

For at least 6,000 years of human history the methods of government and of religion have been tried. One can observe that human behavior has probably improved a little as a result, but not



much. Certainly we humans still remain trapped in the self-defeating and society-retarding competition branch of the above table.

In addition to government and religion, a third approach has been attempted to some extent to resolve this problem of man. That third approach is socialism and its idealization, communism. This approach to modifying man's behavior from the natural competitive to the advantageous cooperative has had less trial time than the attempts of government and religion.

Quite small communities: the earliest Christians, various communities of monks, and a few experimental utopian societies and communes have attempted socialist or communist community life. In the sense being discussed here this kind of community life is one of cooperation and sharing without competition among the members of the community. In its ideal form each member contributes according to his ability and receives according to his needs (communism). In the more limited form each member contributes according to his abilities but is rewarded according to the quality and quantity of his contribution, although the society guarantees some minimum "floor" of quality of life under all of its members regardless of their condition or contribution (socialism).

Those various attempts failed in general because, even with a membership selected voluntarily for participation, human nature was too incompatible with the self-less sharing and cooperation required. Where the communities tended to survive was only in the cases of special controlled religious environments with a substantial element of coercion, that is, strong rule.

Another reason for the lack of success of socialist or communist experiments has been their inherent vulnerability to their competitive, survival-of-the-fittest, neighbors and environment. The most recent attempt to produce a successful socialist society was based on a new approach to dealing with that problem. The approach,

termed Leninism, introduced the concept of "the dictatorship of the proletariat".

The concept of Leninism was that a leadership, itself already philosophically and practically dedicated to socialism and (ultimately) communism, should autocratically impose a socialist society on man. Then, by educating and modifying the citizenry via its autocratic control, it was expected that gradually a socialist / communist society could be evolved. The concept, perhaps "good on paper", fails because of the difficulty of truly modifying human nature and behavior and because the autocratic leadership (also hobbled by being of human nature) becomes simply another exploiting group of "winners" in the age old competition. They give in to the temptation to operate the society for their own benefit.

The social ideal of communism in its ultimate form: from each member of society according to his ability and to each according to his needs, remains a valid ultimate objective. It is even a reasonable test of "how civilized" a society is. The concept is practiced in the nuclear family and has been so practiced for millennia. The concept of that family environment and social organization has never been criticized. Rather, even though the family is a case of essentially pure communism, it is held up and praised as the foundation of society.

Its practice in all of society, as a single big human and humane family, would be communist society.

### *MORE HUMAN NATURE -- THE PROBLEM OF OUR LAZINESS*

By "laziness" is meant the natural inclination of we humans to do as little as possible to get or achieve what we want. We only put out significant effort if we believe that the benefits that we will receive will be in proportion to that effort or even better. If we are guaranteed minimum or adequate support and have little expectation of additional benefit resulting from any additional effort on our part then we are inclined to do as little as possible, just enough to "get by".

This, also, most likely is a natural characteristic evolved in us and in all life. The life competition for survival is always a struggle in the context of insufficient resources to meet the needs of all so that only the better competitors have their needs met sufficiently to enable them to populate the next generation. It takes energy to struggle, to compete; therefore energy is a valuable resource to be husbanded and preserved. The life form that can meet its needs with less energy expenditure is more likely to succeed. Energy conservation, "laziness", is bred in us.

That bodes ill for the success of communism ("from each according to his work -- to each according to his need"). It is a problem for socialism where, although reward is proportional to work, a guaranteed "floor" is provided for everyone. That is why communism can only be achieved when the problem of obtaining material abundance is first solved. With a society of material abundance there can be a reasonable level of laziness and full satisfaction of needs simultaneously.

## 5

# *The Problem of Our Society – Political Economy*

In order to understand the implications of reality for us we need to understand that in the process of our development we have created a new type of entity, sophisticated and complex social organizations and what we refer to as civilization, we need to understand the affect our nature has had and continues to have on that societal environment we create.

### *THE INSTITUTIONS WE CREATE -- POLITICAL ECONOMY*

"Economics" is the contemporary word used for what has traditionally been termed "political economy". "Political economy" is the more accurate term in that most of 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> Century "economics" is involved with manipulating human nature and behavior (a political activity) to achieve intended social and economic results (economy) in spite of, sometimes in contravention of, the underlying "real economics" of the situation.

(It is unfortunate that so many quotation marks must be used to discuss these points. The reason is that the meanings of terminology have changed over the years. Frequently the change in meaning is an intended, caused action not mere language evolution. For example, ever since the "Great Depression" of the 1930's no government and no politician uses the word "depression" no matter how badly the economy is performing. The word "depression" carries too much negative political implication. Consequently, government and politicians have substituted "recession" which sounds less severe. The terminology change also clouds the citizenry's comprehension of what is really happening. From the point of view of most politicians that is a desirable result.)

"Real economics" is the study and implementation of the principles underlying the operation of an economy. Those principles are rather simple and few.

- Before the development of "tool making" intelligent species the economic activity of beings was simply the pursuit of material needs when and as needed -- gathering and hunting food and sustenance.
- Intelligence brought the concepts of planning and of investing in capital tools and equipment:
  - making provision for future needs now, rather than waiting until the need is immediately upon one (saving), and
  - investing some effort now in making the later satisfaction of needs more effective, even if at the cost of less immediate satisfaction now (investment in making tools, research, education).
- Neither of those existed before intelligent beings started applying their intelligence to the situation. Therefore, tools and capital, resulting developments, are the product solely of the labor of persons, both the physical and the intellectual labor of persons.
- The labor of persons is capable of some specific amount of productive result per time period. That is, in a society of humans, behaving according to their nature and consisting of the typical mix of competent and not, conscientious and not, and so forth, a certain amount of useful productive result can be obtained per year. (That might be called the Gross National Product today.)
- The amount of that productive result is increased by better tools, better planning, and organization. But,

better tools and planning and organization require that some of the current effort be diverted to those ends.

- Thus human society, with a certain amount of total useful productive potential at any particular time in any particular circumstances, must decide how much to allocate to current consumption versus how much to allocate to improving future time periods' production.

Economics is, then, really about making those decisions for the allocation of current resources between current needs and future improvement. If a society, such as we, spends more of its resources on current consumption then there will be less improvement in the resources available in future years. If we wish to improve our future conditions it will be at the unavoidable expense of deferring some benefit now. There is no way around this. It is simple reality.

(The economics just described is macro-economics, that of the society and its economy, its productive forces, overall. Once the macro-economic decisions are made numerous further economic evaluations, micro-economics remain. These are of the character more commonly referred to as engineering economics or investment economics. Their issue is: Among alternative ways to effect a particular activity, or among alternative such activities, what is the relative cost and which is the most cost effective, the most economic? For example: Should the river crossing be a bridge or a tunnel? Should an investment in elementary education go to improving teachers, facilities, materials or course content? Should more highways be built or more public transit developed? And so forth.)

"Economics" (that is macro-economics) as a real, societal, decision and management process almost never occurs overtly. Its implicit occurrence cannot be avoided. There is only so much "pie", so much total annual gross production, and each allocation must come out of it. "Political economy" is the process of attempting to avoid, to get around, that problem by the manipulating of society.

"Political economy" is one of the principal on-going activities of government. It is so because government is the instrument of the "winners" in the human competition. It is the means that those at the top of the economic pyramid employ to maintain their position and to keep the essentially unstable situation that the inequitable pyramid embodies from upsetting their dominance and their enjoyment of it.

Man long ago evolved from his pre-human condition, where the competition for survival was one of direct, immediate competition for food, shelter, a mate, and so forth. The evolved man functioning in social organizations, continues the struggle for optimum survival on the new field of competition, the economy. The struggle is still conducted with strength, force and guile, but with the new weapons in the contest of "political economy" rather than "tooth and fang".

Take unemployment, for example. In the most economically advanced contemporary countries the percentage of the total available work force that is unemployed ranges from on the order of 5% to 15% or more. In a country with a work force of 100,000,000 persons that would represent from 5,000,000 to 15,000,000 persons wishing to participate productively in the economy and unable to do so.

All countries have many unfilled needs: repair and improvement of roads, water supplies, sewers, bridges, etc.; better hospitals and medical care; better schooling and teachers; better quality of life for the ill, infirm and elderly; relief of poverty and so forth. The contribution that could be made by those unemployed to resolving those problems is wasted by their unemployment. From 5% to 15% of all the useful results that the society could have is utterly wasted.

In spite of their unemployment those unemployed persons are, nevertheless, eating, wearing clothing, living in residences and in general otherwise similarly surviving. Why would a society elect to feed, clothe and house (albeit minimally) a significant part of its



population free to those recipient persons and not permit them to contribute to productive output and the improvement of the society's condition?

From the point of view of economics it is ridiculous. The economy should be planned and operated so that everyone who can contribute is enabled and encouraged to do so. That course of action would maximize total output and benefit everyone (if the society is being operated equitably, that is to benefit everyone).

But, societies today are not being operated to benefit everyone. They are operated to benefit the top of the economic pyramid at the expense of the rest. That is the current operation of the age-old survival competition. Therefore, from the point of view of political economy, the tool of the ruling wealthy in their operation of society for their benefit, the unemployment makes good sense.

The on-going existence of a substantial number of unemployed persons puts pressure on the rest of the population that lies beneath the economic pyramid's peak. It helps keep them and the economic imbalance under control to maintain the wealthy rulers in power.

- It holds wages down and increases the wealthy's profits.
- It reduces the likelihood that social resentment might turn into protest action because those who are employed do not wish to risk becoming unemployed.
- It pits one part of the population against another tending to prevent their uniting in opposition to their oppressors, deflecting just resentment that should be directed against those oppressors into resentment against their fellow victims.

And who bears this social cost (both the cost of the lost productive output and the cost of allocating part of what productive



output remains to feeding, clothing and housing those unfortunate unemployed)? The wealthy rulers? Of course not. The cost comes out of part of the national product that might otherwise go to the general populace' benefit. That is highly effective political economy in operation.

That state of affairs is totally foreign to rationality. A rational society, a society populated by intelligent beings functioning cooperatively and creatively instead of competitively and destructively, would insure that all of its citizens can be productively active according to their abilities and state in life. The objective of such a society would be the maximizing of the quality of life for all of the citizenry. Such would be the function and objective of societal planning and administration.

But, whatever rationality we have is not used to operate our society to the optimization of benefit for all. It is used to pursue, as we see it, our own individual benefit. We just as surely are caught in constant competition and struggle in our supposedly civilized societies as our primitive forbears were in their wild and barbaric environments.

The most favorite response of the beneficiaries of this unfortunate state of affairs to criticism of it as the above is, "Well, do you of know anything better?" This curious response is popular, also, with some of the victims of the system who, nevertheless, think of themselves as beneficiaries. (Usually this is because they have some other groups of people to "look down on". They consequently can use that to think of themselves as being at least a little "on top".)

The response "do you know of anything better?" is actually a direct agreement that the above presentation of the state of affairs is correct because it acknowledges, by failure to present opposing arguments, that there are none. There can be no argument against it, no contention in logic and rationality in favor of "political economy" and opposed to "economics". But, that "do you know of anything

better?" response is intended as an effective destruction of all criticism of "political economy" and, curiously, most people accept that response as valid and, therefore, they accept the manipulation of their life by "political economy" as the best that they can do.

But, the natural characteristics that we humans bring to the problem of managing our life and our society are largely self-defeating:

- Dominant self-interest and competition to obtain as much as possible for ourselves rather than the cooperation and team work that can produce more for everyone including ourselves, and
- Natural laziness that seeks to let the other person put out the effort and do the work.

In consequence we are saddled with a society operated for the benefit of a few at the expense of the many, a society in which the populace exists for the economy rather than the economy serving the populace, a society in which people are economic units deemed only as workers or as consumers, their only role being to function economically.

## 6

### *What is Civilization ?*

What is civilization? Civilization is the state of condition of persons living and functioning together, jointly, cooperatively so that they produce and experience the benefits of so living and functioning jointly and cooperatively. The word "civilization" derives from the Roman word for "city". It implies a society involving cities, and cities involve people living and acting together, jointly, cooperatively, interactively.

That as counter-posed to people living singly or in very small units, on their own, individually, independently.

Thus civilization involves social cooperation, that is the opposite of individualism's "rugged independence" with its competitive survival of the fittest. Civilization involves joint survival via joint action. Only civilization is capable of providing improved quality of life: security, material abundance, the arts, culture, the possibility of individual fulfillment and of happiness.

Individualism pursues return to the original state, the opposite of civilization, the consequent survival competition, the state of the animals unable to function in any mode other than the competition for survival.

The future of mankind is civilization. Civilization builds on our only real biological advantage -- intelligence and rationality. Civilization implies, means, requires: society, communal action, social sharing, "socialism" and, ultimately, communism, the full cooperative sharing with our fellow persons. Human society must, and it therefore will, so become or we will regress to the animals from which we came.

To support the development of civilization is to be a civilized person. To oppose it is to be primitive, barbarian, essentially an animal.

But, what is the purpose of civilization? What is the purpose of the social structure that we create? Certainly the structure is not an end in itself. To we humans what matters is our personal and individual security, fulfillment and happiness. Therefore, the purpose of civilization must be to promote and achieve that goal.

- The society exists for its individual members -- not the individual members existing for the society.
- The economy exists for society's individual members -- not the members existing for the economy.
- The government exists for the members of society -- not the members existing for the government.

## 7

### *The Evolution to Civilization*

Love is wishing good for the object of your love and acting to bestow that good. Social love is a society based on love -- based on each member wishing and behaving to implement the welfare of the others, of all.

#### *WHY THE SOCIETY OF SOCIAL LOVE IS ESSENTIAL*

Truth is that which conforms to and describes reality. Reality is that which is, not only matter and energy in their various forms but also: feelings and emotions, ideas and cultures, languages and arts, and so forth. Whether we can know, sense, measure or understand some aspect of reality or not it still, nevertheless, is.

Why is this so important? Because, the most significant characteristic of the 20th Century, other than its explosion of technology, was its adoption of the diametrically opposite attitude toward truth and reality -- that truth is different for each person and each case, that it is what each individual perceives it to be -- that there is no objective reality, only the subjective reality as perceived by each individual -- that all is relative.

Aside from the damage that such thinking has done to scientific progress, its most severe damage is the license that it gives. It gives license to create, choose, decide upon one's own "reality" and then act accordingly. "If truth is only my truth then I can have whatever truth I like. If there is no objective reality then I may do as I wish without regard for the effect on others." Such thinking ultimately gives us war, rapine, holocausts.

But, if there is an objective reality, objective truth, then, even if we are not able to completely know and understand it we are still

subject to it, still measured and judged by it, and we feel compelled to behave accordingly.

Thus objective reality and objective truth, which indeed are, are also desirable, beneficial to society. If we must have a god, a standard and judge of behavior, then objective truth and reality are that.

Two fundamental social or societal conclusions that can be drawn from reality, drawn from experience, follow. They are so obvious that their proof is in their statement.

First

*The only way for one to receive humane treatment is for another person to give it. But, we all are "another person" to other persons.*

*Therefore, the only way for us all to consistently receive humane treatment is for us all to consistently give humane treatment.*

Second

*In a society functioning on competition for wealth, power, and control there will always be a pyramid of success having a small number of winners at the top and the rest of the people below.*

*Therefore the chance of being a winner is quite small.*

In the material competition the vast majority of us are losers not winners. That is in the very nature of the competitive mode. The competition can produce only a very small number of *winners*; there has to be a very large number of *losers* to support the economic / social imbalance, for the pyramid arrangement to function.

Furthermore, that arrangement inherently requires a tremendous waste of resources and dissipation of otherwise attainable progress that could benefit all of us, all of society. Those resources

and that potential progress and improved quality of life, rather than going to our benefit, are taken from us by our masters, our conquerors the winners, in the cost of their maintaining their position and their repression of us.

There is only one solution, only one reasonable course of action for we *losers* to take. We must stop playing that game; we must change the rules.

- Would we like to be on top, the *winners* in that competition?

Yes, of course we would.

- Have we any hope of that?

No, no way.

- Well then, in that case, do we then want "good", "right" and "fair" to rule?

Of course we do. It is the *only* way that we can at least be partial *winners*, the only way that we can avoid being total *losers*.

### *WHY THE SOCIETY OF SOCIAL LOVE IS POSSIBLE*

It is not easy to so change the rules.

Our behavior throughout our lives is a constant struggle between: on the one hand the motivations of our material nature to survive, to hunt gather and eat, competing to what ever extent necessary to accomplish those goals and "devil take the hindmost"; and on the other hand the motivations of our rationality, our sense and our conscience, which keep speaking to us about "good" and "bad", "right" and "wrong", "love", "justice" and "fairness".

As our intelligence has gradually developed we have, nevertheless, been dominated by the material origin of our nature. It is so ingrained in us that we cannot easily act contrary to it. Yet, we

have arrived at the point where our experience shows us that our capitulation to our material side is self-defeating.

History and experience demonstrate absolutely that so long as our society functions according to its material "survival of the fittest", competitive mode, that long will it be the pyramid of a very small number of dominating *winners* at the top and a vast mass of deprived, repressed humanity, the *losers*, underneath, supporting those few *winners*.

But, we are all victims of "the prisoner's dilemma". The dilemma, which can be presented in various forms, is as follows. Two persons are captured by authorities as suspects of having committed a crime, are held prisoner and are kept and interrogated separately. Each is told, "If you will cooperate and implicate the other then you will be treated leniently."

The problem of each of the prisoners is that if the authorities had sufficient proof they would not need the sought confessions nor the implicating of the partner prisoner. Therefore if both prisoners are silent they will go free. But, if either prisoner accepts the authorities' "deal" the other prisoner will suffer the full penalty.

Should the prisoner being questioned accept the partial benefit of leniency assuming that he cannot rely upon his partner's loyalty, or should he go for total freedom counting on his partner's doing the same, but at the risk of the full penalty because of his partner having testified against him to obtain leniency ?

In society, if we all behave humanely (both prisoners refuse to confess) we all benefit. But if some persons pursue wealth, power and control (our partner prisoner implicates us) while the rest of us assume that everyone is cooperating (while we were loyal to him), then that rest of us become the base of the pyramid supporting the aggressive few (he gets off and we get the full penalty).



If we cannot count on our fellow citizens' abstaining from power and exploitation (if we are not sure our partner prisoner will stay loyal), are we not better off taking "half a cake rather than none" by pursuing whatever small wealth, power and control we can (implicating our partner to obtain leniency)?

Clearly, the prisoners dilemma situation favors those who have captured the prisoners and hold them incommunicado. Likewise, in society the situation favors those who are the aggressive pursuers of wealth, power and control and operates against the majority of the citizenry who would like a humane environment but find it difficult to progress toward it.

At every moment our material nature and self-deluding perceived opportunities to win tempt us back to the old ways. Only fixing our gaze on the irrevocable fact, we cannot be winners so let's be cooperators, can save us.

The solution to the dilemma is to implement the desired social policy not by radical change but by progressive development of social thinking. Individuals can only be counted on to behave at a level of social responsibility and humaneness that corresponds to the more or less social norm of their time and environment. It is hopeless to count on heroic, altruistic or even citizen-like motivation to improve society.

The change in attitude toward social behavior, the improved concept of what is socially criminal must evolve. It must come from the people and become part of what the people are. It must come about not as an overtly or formally agreed upon rule but, rather, as the gradually developed innate ethic, the fundamental *moré*, that we live by.

We must come to feel about struggling to climb to the top on the backs of our fellow persons as we now feel about neglecting our children, murdering our parents, hypocrisy, stealing and lying.

It is easy to say such things, to advocate such goals and behavior; the history of mankind is replete with such advocacy. But, how do we actually move toward the goal? How do words become actions?

Curiously, the method is quite simple and has already long existed and operated. That is why we have made the small progress that has been obtained so far in progressing toward true civilization. Throughout our history we have, in fact, been following the method, not consciously but nevertheless inevitably. We need now merely recognize it, consciously adopt and pursue it, and hone the method to maximum effectiveness by working to accelerate its operation. The method operates as follows.

Because, apparently, we are basically well-intentioned beings when not in too dire straits, and because we are rather weak in ambition, self control, and self discipline, the standards that we proclaim are always significantly higher than our actual performance relative to those standards. Prodded by our inner conscience, we are always contending levels of social and personal moral and ethical behavior that are significantly above the levels at which we actually perform. That behavior has so characterized human behavior and the human experience over so many millennia that one is forced to conclude that it is inherent in us.

(That conclusion is not unreasonable. Our standards would tend to be based on our desires for ourselves, how we would wish to be treated. Our external behavior must in addition deal with our laziness and our inherent competitiveness in the struggle for survival.)

That very fact, that very characteristic of us as sentient beings, has produced the moral and ethical progress we have so far achieved. And, while we see a long path of needed progress ahead of us; nevertheless, we have already progressed by a significant distance from our animal origins.

- Because the level of our intentions is higher than that of our performance there is continuous pressure tending to produce some consequent progress in the raising of our performance.
- As our performance improves our standards of behavior, our intentions, also tend to rise.
- This process iterates generation by generation and yields the extremely slow but inexorable progress that we have made and are making.

This does not really require that individuals change as individuals. Rather, the advance is by generations. The point to which society has arrived by virtue of the progress that the prior generation made is simply to the next generation the way things always were, the usual, normal, taken for granted status of society. It is their starting point.

Societally we tend to perform, on the average, at the average level of our standards. That average includes all of the range from high noble standards at one end of the range to the worst aspects of current society at the other. As a result there is some pressure to eliminate or ameliorate those worst aspects. And the result of that elimination or relief of the worst aspects is a new, somewhat higher average level of the standard because it is now an average over the same range of values except that it omits the eliminated worst aspects.

We even tend to further elevate our most noble standards at the high end of the range because the elimination of our current worst aspects of society and the consequent rise in our average standards tend to make new higher standards seem to be more possible. They become reasonable when before they had seemed to be hopelessly unrealistic.

Thus we see that the evolution to a humane society, to true civilization, is possible. That evolution is going on now; it has been

going on and it will continue to do so. Its action has been and is innate, inherent, a natural aspect of human society .

But the progress is slow, agonizingly and sufferingly slow.

### *HOW THE SOCIETY OF SOCIAL LOVE CAN BE ACHIEVED*

Then, how can we further this action, contribute to this progress, hone the method to greater effectiveness? By doing these three things.

- Recognize that this process occurs and is the means to ultimate humane, rational civilization and, therefore, work personally to raise standards and eliminate worst aspects of society.
- Enlist, inform and educate fellow men, society, in that recognition, that work, and that contribution to progress.
- Persist. Work hard at the project and persist in patience.

The goal cannot be achieved by coercion. It cannot be achieved by some special elite. It cannot be achieved by asking for heroic or even merely special sacrifice by people. All of those methods have been tried by religions, governments and revolutionaries with their supposed elites of clergy or statesmen or party leaders. In spite of its initial self-sacrificing dedication the leadership eventually always gives in to the temptation to use its dominant position to further its own selfish interests and to abandon the pursuit of the people's overall individual and collective social interests.

A truly humane and rationally ordered society can only come from the people, can only be achieved by the gradual evolution of society over the generations, over generations of reducing and eliminating bad and raising standards of good. The humane society

can only be achieved by generations of evolving the innate standards of all mankind to the level that social love is reasonable and natural.

But, the need for patience, the fact of slow progress, or the multi-generational length of the task must never excuse failure to diligently strive for the goal. Every individual is either part of the solution or part of the problem. He is either a contributor to the betterment of mankind or in actual effect, and therefore in fact, a supporter of the continuing of the so damaging, so wasteful, competitive jungle of human society. There is no "neutral ground" no non-involvement.

### *CONCLUSION*

The import, the message of this entire work, is as follows.

There is no God, no divine justice, no "fairness" at all. The universe is, itself, a non-sentient, non-"feeling", material existence. It does not "care". It simply functions according to its natural nature, according to essentially simple modes of behavior set by its nature. It is, and it "behaves" in a manner that is neither "good" nor "bad" in the ethical or moral sense. "Good", "bad", and "fair" are values that arise out of intelligence, out of reasoning applied to experience.

We (and presumably other) rational beings who have arisen through the operation of that universe are a special "hybrid" a combination of:

- all of the natural consequences of a material universe operating according to its nature, the competition for survival, and
- the judgmental concepts that rationality gives rise to: "right" and "wrong", "good" and "bad", "love", "justice" and "fairness".

These two aspects of our nature arose from the natural universe and are part of its nature; but, there is no universal or cosmic enforcement of those judgmental values that arise from intelligence.

Their implementation is up to us, to us "on our own", alone.

If we persist in our pursuit of self-interested personal welfare, personal satisfaction and gain, with poor regard for our neighbor, then we shall be victims condemned by ourselves as the inevitable consequence of our own actions to being and living in such a society.

If we face up to these truths and participate rationally in society and humanely in our lives and day to day existence with each other, then we shall, to that extent, enjoy the benefits of such a society.

And,

If we teach others these truths and if we are each a humane example then we will bring the civilization of social love into being.

This is not a matter of morals or some objective rule imposed from outside our society. Rather, it is the only way to our ultimate successful functioning as a society of rational beings.

The task is, then, to create true civilization, a society of truth, love and justice. The method is to shift society gradually but persistently ever more and more in the direction of disapproval and non-acceptance of social injustice and of personal selfish, aggressive, self-centered behavior.

We must become the environment in which we wish to be. That "becoming" is the final stage of our evolution.

## 8

# *On Democracy and the Governmental Organization of Society*

## *THE PRESENT PROBLEMS OF GOVERNMENT AND SOCIETY*

### *- ABUSE OF POWER*

The paradox of socio - political power is that, without some new development, that is some new method or technique, socio - political power will always reside in a relatively small number of persons who collectively dominate a relatively much larger population, society at large.

The reason for that is that the exercise of socio - political power, that is the control of a society at large, requires organization. The relatively small group of leading / dominating persons exercising the socio - political power can and must be organized such that they function with sufficient unity of purpose, plan, methods, and actions so as to maintain their rule over, and the supporting socio - economic functioning of, the ruled mass of society so that they supply the material and personal needs of the rulers, individually and collectively.

But on the other hand, the large number of persons populating society at large are because of their numbers and their diversity generally unable to so organize themselves and, being a diverse mix, are easily coerced and propagandized into their own disunity.

Therefore, human society will always be in the form of a mass of the general population dominated and controlled by a relatively small ruling minority unless some method or technique can be found to off-set the organizational advantage of the rulers relative to the ruled.

The overwhelmingly dominant characteristic of the various organizations of human societies and their institutions at present and historically is the abuse of power. That is, the exercise of power to some extent is essential in the governing and administration of any organization or society, and for that reason the members of the society consent to the bestowing or delegating of power to the leaders of the society. Of course, that consent is given with the judicious exercise of that power in mind and intended, but power in the hands of the leaders always and invariably leads to its abuse.

As with any crime, the abuse of power results from motive and opportunity. The motive is our natural, “survival of the fittest”, human selfishness, the favoring of our own personal self interest regardless of the adverse affect on our fellow humans. The opportunity is, of course, the coming into the position to exercise power.

*- THE NATURE AND ROLE OF POLITICAL RULERS –  
POLITICIANS*

In general all rulers, whether conquerors, autocrats, politicians, or whatever have only one significant skill, one expertise of significance: the skill and expertise of getting themselves into power and maintaining that position. They are, in general, not particularly skilled at governing, administration, planning, budgeting, and so forth. Their specialty is forcing or deceiving their way into the ruling power positions of the society and maintaining themselves there.

Yes, there is variation in the kind and amount of skills in those people. Some are more intelligent than others; some are more effective liars; some are better planners; some better propagandists; and so forth. But, in general, it is not expertise at running a society optimally that rulers and politicians have; it is their skill at getting and keeping themselves in power.

Of course, that is the opposite of what society needs. Society



needs to be run, administered by intelligent skilled persons doing the best job possible of solving the problems and effecting the progress and improvement of the society; not by “carpet baggers” bent only on keeping themselves in office.

Furthermore, politicians are frauds. They constantly receive monies called “campaign contributions” or other favors from persons wealthy enough to have funds to spare for the purpose. And the purpose is not love nor admiration for the politician. The funds are a bribe, a simple and direct purchase of governmental action in favor of the bribe giver. And, of course, the politicians, liking the bribes, legislate them to be legal, not bribes, and exercise the power of their political positions for the benefit of the bribe-givers.

All of that is obvious, but the problem is what to do about it; the problem is how to better organize society so that the politicians are eliminated and the society is operated rationally, optimally.

*- DEMOCRACY: THE PRESENT CONTENTED SOLUTION*

Every individual member of a society personally conceives of the objective of the organization and operation of society as being the furthering of his own personal security, welfare, comfort, and happiness.

That being the case, it is generally assumed that the optimum form of government is democracy; that is, a government in which each individual expresses his own personal set of preferences with the majority preferred result for each specific preference being that which is implemented.

But, history and experience demonstrate that that does not work. It invariably fails to result in the society being as its members would prefer. It results merely in a different minority ruling group dominating the society for their own benefit.

To achieve a successful democratic society two conditions must be met. First the entire populace exercising their democratic

choices must be educated and accurately informed at least enough for them to understand the issues involved and to correctly evaluate proposed courses of action. Second, the conditions of life of that populace must be such that they are not coerced nor distracted from making sound, rational democratic choices.

But, neither of those conditions are present, nor have ever been present, in human society. Past and present human societies do not provide the requisite education, and even if they did the level of intelligence in the human populace varies over a wide range. Furthermore, the economic status of the members of the populace varies widely. Some of them are able to dominate the supplying of information and opinion while others are so desperate in their struggle for mere survival that they are coerced and distracted from sound democratic choices or even from attempting to exercise expression of their preferences at all.

Thus it would appear that real democracy is impractical, if not impossible, and human society is condemned to suffering under the abuse of power by a ruling minority. But that is not the case. By examining the nature and conditions of the problem a new construct of society designed to produce a just democratic society is possible.

## *A NEW ORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AND SOCIETY*

### *- GENERAL PRINCIPLES*

#### *· Economic Socialism*

In human society there are persons who contribute to generating the supply of material goods and services in proportion to their ability to do so and persons who are unable to so contribute, that is: the sick, the disabled, children and the elderly. Just conduct of such society is the allocation of sufficient material goods and services to each member of the society so that his needs are satisfied and the allocation of any remaining excess among the members of the society in partial satisfaction of their desires and preferences in some

proportion to their contribution to the social production of goods and services for the society. The reasons for this are as follows.

- First, the society chooses to meet the needs of the contributors because they are necessary, they are the principal generator of goods and services; the needs of the sick and disabled because anyone in the community could next fall victim to that state [the policy is that of mutual insurance]; and the needs of the children and the elderly because the children are necessary to the future and to assure the care of the elderly, a state that all members of the society expect eventually to enter.
- Second, the nature of rational beings, having evolved from competitive survival of the fittest to the level of civilization, is such that only by the distribution of satisfaction of people's wants [things that persons want that are not essential needs] in a fashion that recognizes the relative value of recipients' contributions will society's members be motivated to maximize the generation of social goods and motivated to justly share goods rather than pursue their own good at the expense of others.
- Third, there can never be enough goods to satisfy all wants because as wants become satisfied beings develop new, additional wants. That is, wants are inherently unlimited whereas the means to satisfy wants are inherently limited.

Those philosophical principles and observations on the nature of social reality mean that society should function on the basis of "from each according to his ability and to each according to his contribution performance", with a socially optimal floor and a reasonably limited range of highest to lowest; in other words, economic socialism.

#### · Individual Security and Self Realization

Those philosophical principles and observations also mean that the society must provide and guarantee to every member:

- Education and training to the limit of the person's ability to receive and use it;
- Socially useful employment;
- A personal income sufficient to meet needs and some modicum of wants;
- Personal security against unfair and unreasonable treatment;
- Health and medical care to the maximum extent reasonable;
- Support and care in old age;
- In general, the conditions for a fulfilling and meaningful life,
  - personal development to the extent that each individual is capable,
  - and the conditions for the pursuit of happiness.
- Restricted Personal Wealth

Personal wealth generates personal power because wealth makes it possible for the wealthy to purchase and control the services and activities of other persons. Personal power generates personal wealth because the power gives one control over other persons activities. For society to be free of a ruling minority there must be close restrictions on personal wealth in order to prevent the acquisition of personal power.

That obvious principle that personal wealth must be controlled requires the following socialist conditions. There must be:

- no private ownership of economic property,
- no personal or private employees,
- no accumulation of significant personal wealth,
- and limitations on personal income.

· Representative Democracy

True democratic implementation of the wishes of the general

populace requires that the legislatures determining the actions and policies of the society accurately represent the preferences of the populace.

That obvious principle means that legislatures must be populated by random selection among the general populace so as to achieve a democratic representative sample. That means eliminating all of: elections, seeking of political office, electoral campaigning, professional politicians and politics as a career.

The random selection of legislators should discard, as a practical matter, selection of persons who: are under age, are too sick or disabled to serve, have already been selected in the past, and those who are members of the group of significantly above average intelligence and education who have delimited expert advice and specialty roles in the society [the “intelligentsia”, see below]. Otherwise, service should be mandatory for those so selected except for unusual personal circumstances approved by the corresponding government level legislature on a case-by-case basis. Upon completion of such mandatory service all selected persons must be guaranteed return to their prior position and career or the equivalent.

### · Voting

Each citizen is assigned an “allocation level” that determines his relative standing in the compensation ladder and in eligibility for benefits that are only available in limited amounts [e.g. vacation resorts]. The allocation level is earned based upon “effort” [the citizen’s demonstrated attitude toward contributing to society] and “contribution” [the objective value or usefulness of the citizen’s contributions to society].

Instead of elections to determine who “wins” and occupies a position, the after-the-fact performance “on the job” of all person’s is periodically evaluated with the outcome affecting the rated person’s subsequent level in the allocation of society’s benefits; that is, the “applicable electorate” rates the persons being evaluated on “effort”

and on “contribution” and the collection of those ratings determines that person’s revised allocation level.

Such periodic evaluations apply to every person in the society excepting children before the age of responsibility or accountability and the seriously ill or seriously disabled. They apply to legislators; governmental executives, managers, and staff; industrial / commercial / social leaders, managers, and staff; the intelligentsia [see below], all workers, and the retired elderly.

By “the applicable electorate” is meant in general the practical constituency involved. For national leaders or managers the electorate would be the entire populace; for a local community it would be the populace of that community. For an industrial/commercial enterprise the applicable electorate could range from the entire populace [for large, major enterprises] to the local community for local enterprises. Workers would be evaluated by their peers and supervisors, the retired elderly by the populace of their local community.

The allocation level is initially assigned, at the commencement from early childhood to having achieved the maturity of responsibility and accountability, by local community leaders with regard to “effort” [implemented attitude in and toward the local community] and by local educators with regard to “contribution” [contribution potential according to education level, relative specialty usefulness and difficulty, and quality [grades].

Allocation levels should also be specifically reset by the judiciary as a result of judicial convictions, determinations, rulings, appeals, and so forth.

#### · Government Executives

Those persons having governmental executive power represent the greatest danger of abuse of power and re-installation of a ruling minority. Consequently persons becoming such executives

must be closely controlled. The following procedures and restrictions, or others to equivalent effect, should be imposed.

- Executives for a particular level of government are chosen by that level's legislators:

- from the members of their legislature [whom they know and can evaluate];
- who have so served for several years [and therefore have experience].

- All executives:

- are a triumvirate of three persons;
- whose actions require a majority or consensus as determined by the legislature;
- serve for a fixed term [some moderate number of years];
- unless earlier dismissed because of poor evaluation [Voting, above];
- once having served are barred from later again being a government executive.
- Expert Advice and Specialists

Legislators statistically, randomly selected as above presented will not necessarily have the requisite intelligence, experience and education needed to most effectively legislate in the interests of the society. The same has been true of professional politicians all along, of course, their principal skill being getting themselves into office, not the skills of governing. The randomly selected legislatures should be no worse in that regard than the politically selected ones, and they might be better. Nevertheless, clearly advice and guidance by experts and specialists is advisable. Such counseling is the role of the intelligentsia, those of significantly above average intelligence and education.

There are two reasons for setting up the intelligentsia as a



special category in the organization of society's government: first, their capabilities are needed and second, it is also necessary to prevent their becoming a power unto themselves, another ruling minority, even if perhaps benevolent.

The role of these intelligentsia is to be assigned to various panels of experts and as members of those panels provide advice, analyses and studies [a role analogous to the U.S. National Academy of Sciences], to serve as administrators under the supervision of executives [a role analogous to present governments' senior civil servants], and to serve as a judiciary [the courts and their associated attorneys].

The legislators determine the details of this role; that is, they either directly or through one such panel of experts define the type and characteristics of the panels and expertises to be involved, define the qualifications determining who is and is not a member of that intelligentsia, and assign them to populate those panels.

Aside from the above defined role, all members of the intelligentsia are prohibited from being legislators [are rejected if picked by the random selection process] and from being executives [they are not members of the legislator pool from which executives are chosen].

### · Money and Medium of Exchange

Money or whatever other media of exchange of values is in use is fundamental to exercise of power. Therefore, in order to prevent wrongful acquisition of power, all money, currency, and any other media of exchange must be closely controlled. The role of debit and credit cards in contemporary society shows a method to achieve that control.

All media of exchange must be invalidated other than transactions through a central accounting system in which each individual and each organization has a currency account. All buying, selling, giving and receiving of gifts, fines and penalties, and



governmental and business enterprise transactions are bookkeeping entries between the accounts of the parties involved. That produces complete transparency of those transactions. Barter must be illegal; although it would be difficult to prevent all barter transactions its being illegal should sufficiently prevent such transactions on a large enough scale to be a power threat to society.

Each individual's "allocation level" operates in two ways.

- First it determines each individual's periodic personal income, which is paid as a periodic credit to the individual's currency account. That income as a minimum must be sufficient for the individual to pay for his needs. As allocation level improves income and the ability to purchase more wants increases.

- Second it establishes for each individual his ration share of access to wants that are inherently so limited that they must be rationed in some fashion. [In ruler-dominated societies the rationing is done by an immense range of personal incomes and personal wealth so that pricing completely beyond most of the population's ability to pay limits access to the rationed quantities to the rulers and to some extent to their aides and cooperating supporters.]

In a socialist society it would seem reasonable to make as much as possible of the minimum needs of all of the citizens be free rather than being paid for, the minimum personal income level being reduced accordingly. However, people will invariably tend to be wasteful of things that are free and abundantly available to them. Consequently, even a high socialist society must require that everything that can be wasted be paid for with, again, income levels set accordingly.

There are nevertheless a number of needs that can be provided free because it is not possible for individuals to significantly waste them. A primary example is public transportation. Socially useful examples are news media and broadcast information because they contribute to an educated and knowledgeable populace.

## *A SAMPLE NEW CONSTRUCT OF SOCIETY AND ITS GOVERNANCE*

### *- GOVERNMENT:*

#### *· Legislative*

Legislatures exist and operate at each of the various several geographic or populace areas of jurisdiction from the lowest local level to the highest level of the society

Legislators are randomly selected for an initial two year term of incumbency as the means to true representative democracy.

Legislators are evaluated by the populace corresponding to the area of jurisdiction of the legislature.

Such selected legislators whose end-of-first-term evaluation does not decrease their “allocation level” are deemed selected for second terms.

Such selected legislators whose end-of-second-term evaluation does not decrease their “allocation level” are deemed selected for final terms.

Such selected legislators whose end-of-final-term evaluation does not decrease their “allocation level” are empanelled as candidates for the executive.

Persons who have ever served any term or terms as legislator are ruled out of all further random selections of legislators.

The legislators choose their legislature leaders and committee chairmen from legislature members serving their final term.

#### *· Executive*

Executives exist and operate at each of the various several geographic or populace areas of jurisdiction from the lowest local level to the highest level of the society

Legislators of the area of jurisdiction choose the next term's executives from the group of its legislators whose final terms have ended and who have been empanelled as candidates for the executive because their end-of-final-term evaluation did not decrease their allocation level.

All executive positions are a triumvirate of three executives each for a six year term the three executives' terms being staggered by two years each. Each is evaluated at the end of every two years.

Executives are evaluated by the populace corresponding to the area of jurisdiction of their office or position.

If the end-of-term evaluation does not decrease the allocation level of the executive completing his first or second two year term he continues to his second or third two year term, otherwise his incumbency is cancelled and the legislators choose a new executive to be incumbent for that second or third two year term.

No person may serve in any particular executive governmental position more than six years in his life; however he can serve in other non-governmental managerial or executive positions [see below Industry and Commerce].

The executive staffs the administrative, managerial, technical and specialty positions within his jurisdiction from its panel of specialty experts. Such "experts" may be appointed to administrative and/or staff and/or advisory positions, but not to executive positions. Such persons cannot involuntarily be removed from the position to which appointed except upon receiving an evaluation that reduces their allocation level or by judicial action.

The performance of selected, appointed experts is evaluated by their peers and their next inferior and superior executives with the outcome affecting the person's subsequent level in the allocation of society's benefits, i.e. ratings on "effort" and on "contribution".

· Judicial and Audit

A panel of judicial and audit specialists is designated by, and per criteria produced by, each legislature.

The three most senior members, in terms first of longest period of service on the panel and then age, of each such panel are designated the executive of the panel. Each of the three executives serve for six years, staggered at two year intervals, or until an evaluation resulting in a reduction of allocation level is received prior to the end of that term.

Having once been panel executive they are no longer eligible to be executive of the panel.

The functions of that panel are to provide a judiciary [a system of courts, their judges, and the associated attorneys] and to perform an independent audit ["inspector general"] function for all government and commercial or industrial enterprise activities corresponding to the level in the society of the designating legislature.

- Courts, judges, and attorneys will always be needed because some members of society will act criminally and because there always will be disputes between members of the society.
- The independent audit "inspector general" function will always be needed because persons in a position to do so will always, individually and in groups, seek to conceal their mistakes or illegal self-favoring from adversely affecting their allocation level.

"Judicial and Audit Experts" panel members are automatically ruled out of random legislative selections [which means that they are also ineligible for government executive positions].

The panel members in use at any particular time /for any particular project by the government are selected and appointed by the executive of the panel.

The performance of selected, appointed judicial and audit experts is evaluated by their peers and by the corresponding legislature with the outcome affecting the person's subsequent level in the allocation of society's benefits, i.e. ratings on "effort" and on "contribution".

A member of a Judicial and Audit Panel may not at the same time be a member of any other panel and vice versa.

· General Expertive [Excludes the arts for which see below]

A panel of "expert generalists" is designated by, and per criteria produced by, each legislature. The functions of that panel are to advise those legislators and their corresponding executives, and:

- to rate the performance of the members of their own panel [along with ratings of them performed by the legislators who designated them and their corresponding executives], and
- to rate the performance of the "expertive" panel of art critics, art educators and aesthetic specialists [see below] [along with the ratings of those persons by their other panel members and by the artists]

The members of the panel of "expert generalists" serve successive two year terms and their performance is rated at the end of each term by the members of that panel and by those legislators who designated them.

Expert generalists serve successive terms on their panel until assigned to a different panel either by legislative initiative and action or by legislative action upon their receiving a current panel evaluation that reduces their allocation level.

"Expert generalists" panel members are automatically ruled out of random legislative selections [which means that they are also ineligible for government executive positions].

· Specialty Expertise [Less the arts for which see below]

Panels of “Specialty Experts” are designated per criteria [nature and quality of expertises] produced by the legislature.

“Specialty Experts” panel members are automatically ruled out of random legislative selections [which means that they are also ineligible for government executive positions].

The panel members in use at any particular time for any particular project by the government are selected / appointed by the legislative leader or government executive applicable at the level of the activity involved. Such “experts” may be appointed to administrative and / or staff and / or advisory positions, but not to executive positions [to which only a legislature can make appointments].

The performance of selected / appointed experts in non-executive positions is evaluated by their peers and their next inferior and superior executives with the outcome affecting the person’s subsequent level in the allocation of society’s benefits, i.e. ratings on “effort” and on “contribution”.

· The Arts

An “expertise” panel of art critics, art educators and aesthetic specialists is designated per criteria produced by the legislature and that panel designates panels of artists in various artistic and cultural specialties.

This panel is evaluated by its members, by the overall body of artists and by the members of the panel of general experts [see above].

The three most senior, in terms first of longest period of service on the panel and then age, members of each such panel are designated the executive of the panel. Each of the three executives serve for six years, staggered at two year intervals, or until an evaluation resulting in a reduction of allocation level is received prior

to the end of that term.

Having once been panel executive they are no longer eligible to be executive of the panel.

“Experts” panel members and “Artists” panel members are automatically ruled out of random legislative selections [which means that they are also ineligible for government executive positions].

Artists are assigned or allocated to arts institutions, positions, performances, etc. by the “expertive” panel [or panel-designated sub-panels] of art critics, art educators and aesthetic specialists with mandatory counseling by the panel of artists.

Artists are periodically evaluated by the other artists and by the “expertive” panel of art critics, art educators and aesthetic specialists with the outcome affecting the artist’s subsequent level in the allocation of society’s benefits, i.e. ratings on “effort” and on “contribution”.

#### *- INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE*

Legislators of the area of jurisdiction applicable to any particular industrial or commercial enterprise choose the next term’s executive of that enterprise from the panel of specialty experts of that jurisdiction.

All executive positions are a triumvirate of three executives each for a six year term the three executives’ terms being staggered by two years each..

These executives are evaluated by the populace corresponding to the area of jurisdiction of their office/position. That populace includes the population of the pertinent geographical community and all of the workers in the enterprise.

If the end-of-term evaluation does not decrease the allocation level of the executive completing his first or second two year term he continues to his second or third two year term, otherwise his



incumbency is cancelled and the legislators choose a new executive to be incumbent for that second or third two year term.

In no case can any person serve in any particular executive more than six years in his life; however he can serve in other non-governmental managerial/executive positions.

The executive staffs the administrative, managerial, technical and specialty positions within his enterprise from its panel of specialty experts. Such “experts” may be appointed to administrative and/or staff and/or advisory positions in the enterprise, but not to executive positions [to which only a legislature can make appointments]. Such persons cannot involuntarily be removed from the position to which appointed except upon receiving an evaluation that reduces their allocation level or by judicial action.

The performance of selected/appointed experts in non-executive positions is evaluated by their peers and their peer and next inferior and superior executives with the outcome affecting the person’s subsequent level in the allocation of society’s benefits, i.e. ratings on “effort” and on “contribution”.

*- TRANSPARENCY OF LEGISLATURES AND EXECUTIVES  
MEETINGS*

All meetings of legislators acting as their legislature, all meetings of portions of legislatures such as committees, all meetings between two or more legislators, all meetings of executive triumvirates, and all meetings of any two of the three executives of an executive triumvirate are required to be completely open, audio-visually recorded with the recordings being retained as permanent records, and presented audio-visually live or promptly in the communications and information media.

All such meetings must be attended and observed [either by physical presence or by observation of live media broadcast] by some members of the general populace [an activity especially appropriate



for the retired and disabled], and members of the communications and information media and of the applicable judicial independent audit panel.

All legislators are forbidden from communicating in any fashion other than a few words of greeting with another legislator of their legislature unless the above openness conditions are present. This prohibition includes all occasions: governmental, social, family, and other.

All executives are forbidden from communicating in any fashion other than a few words of greeting with another executive of their executive triumvirate unless the above openness conditions are present. This prohibition includes all occasions: governmental, social, family, and other.

· Secrecy

Certain specific matters may be made exceptions to the requirement of complete openness as follows.

- The anonymity of a private individual for whom the disclosure of his identity could place him in danger or otherwise be harmful to him or to the society in general.
- Effective dates of specific events or their location if necessary to prevent harm to the events or to the society in general.
- Details of negotiations with other parties not part of this government / society if necessary to the success of the negotiations.
- Plans for action relative to other parties not part of this government / society if necessary to preserve their effectiveness.

Such matters may only be made exceptions to the requirement of complete openness under the following conditions.

- All such exceptions must have a termination date not more than five years after the inception of the exception; and they may not be renewed other than by the same procedure by which they were first put into effect.
- Such exceptions may only be authorized at and by the supreme legislature of the society such authorization to be authorization of a type or types of exception with definitions and rules to control its use and requiring the same approvals as required for amendments to this constitution [see below].
- Any such exception implemented at a level of government other than the supreme level may only be authorized by the other level's legislature and must be in accordance with the rules and requirements for it set out by the supreme legislature.

· "Lobbying"

The first form of "lobbying" is persons, who are not legislators nor executives, seeking to persuade legislators or executives to adopt the lobbyist's opinions or positions or to persuade legislators or executives to adopt or pursue courses of action advocated by the lobbyist.

- The only persons permitted to do this first form of lobbying are intelligentsia members of expertive panels, and for them lobbying is permitted only upon request by the legislator or legislators or executive or executives.
- Legislators and executives are otherwise prohibited from allowing or participating in such lobbying.

The second form of lobbying is persons, who are not intelligentsia members of expertive panels and are not legislators nor executives, seeking to persuade persons who are intelligentsia members of expertive panels to adopt the lobbyist's opinions or

positions, or to persuade persons who are intelligentsia members of expertive panels to themselves seek to persuade legislators or executives whom they might find themselves advising to adopt or pursue courses of action advocated by the lobbyist.

- Such lobbying is permitted but only upon request by intelligentsia members of expertive panels; and they may make such requests only with regard to the specific subject area of specific requests that the intelligentsia member has received from a legislator or legislators or executive or executives, and only with regard to the stated-in-advance subject of the request.
- Intelligentsia members of expertive panels are otherwise prohibited from allowing or participating in such lobbying.

The third form of lobbying is the seeking to persuade persons, who will be evaluating other persons in evaluations that will affect those person's allocation level, to evaluate some person or person's in a direction that the lobbyist favors. Such lobbying is permitted; however, paying or receiving any form of payment or compensation for doing such lobbying is forbidden.

The final form of lobbying is the seeking to persuade persons of the general populace, who might therefore become legislators or through that become executives, to adopt the lobbyist's opinions or positions or to adopt or advocate courses of action advocated by the lobbyist. Such lobbying is permitted; however, receiving any form of payment or compensation for doing such lobbying is forbidden.

For both the third and the final form of lobbying, defined above, private organizations as prescribed further below may use funds contributed by members to pay costs incurred in this form of lobbying other than pay or compensation to persons, costs such as for printing, office supplies, use of broadcast facilities, advertisements,

and the like.

*- AMENDING THE CONSTITUTION DEFINING THE SOCIETY*

Any amendment, change or revision of the structure, organization or operation of the society must require a substantial [for example two-thirds] approval by both the general populace and, separately, all of the collective intelligentsia.

Other than provisions for exceptions set out above, exceptions to the above rules and requirements, whether permanent or temporary, may only be put into effect as amendments per the above procedure.

*FREEDOM AND THE NEW CONSTRUCT OF SOCIETY*

*- THE ISSUE OF FREEDOM*

There will be opponents of such a just and democratic society saying, “What about freedom?”. But, “freedom” has always only been available to the rulers; and has always been denied the general populace. The rulers are free to pursue their self interest at the expense of the society. The rest of society is coerced and deceived into supporting that rule. As was once said, “The poor are equally free with the rich to sleep under the bridges of Paris.”

By “freedom” people intend “being able to do, or at least pursue, whatever they want”. But most people, or at least too many people for the social good, want more personal wealth and personal power for themselves than others have. They want to be superior in wealth and power and, no matter how much they may accrue, they are never satisfied, always seeking more wealth and power and greater superiority.

That kind of freedom cannot be permitted. It is the “freedom” of the rulers.

A society that insures that no person is economically coerced by deprivation, that insures that each individual can develop to the

maximum extent of which he is capable, that aids each individual in that development, that is structured to produce a societal environment that reflects the preferences of the general populace, and that prevents any ruling minority exploiting the rest of society, is a society of freedom. In that society everyone is free.

Prior societies, ruled by power and wealth controlling minorities, are and have been all propagandized in opposition to any alternative society. Their rulers dominate what appears in the media and direct it all toward their purpose of denigrating any alternatives to their rule. Of course, those very facts make all of their contentions deceiving.

The test of the honesty or deception in information presented and conclusions contended is always one simple principle: *Qui bono* – who benefits from the presentation and conclusion. If it is not the general populace that benefits then the information presented and conclusions drawn or advocated are ruler deception. That test applies to those who say, “What about freedom?”.

#### - THE ISSUE OF RELIGION

Any religion that expresses or acts on its wish that government recognize and/or cooperate with it is also, simultaneously, a religion that seeks to impose its concepts and rules on all other people. Therefore, the “freedom” of such religions is contrary to the freedom in general of the populace and cannot be permitted.

That is not to say that people should be prohibited from having whatever personal beliefs they care to entertain. They must be free to believe what they wish [and could not be prevented from doing so in any case]. It is reasonable in general [but not always specifically in all cases] to permit whatever personal practices they wish to pursue or impose on themselves. But that freedom cannot include seeking to seduce others to those beliefs or imposing them on others or interfering with the legitimate free activities of others.

Persuading, teaching, or explaining religious [or any other] beliefs falls in the category of “lobbying” treated above and the restrictions on which apply.

And, that last statement applies to the parenting of children. Children are not the property of their parents; they are not the “property” of anyone nor of any organization. But, children become the next generation’s adult citizens of the society. The society in general has a dominant interest in the upbringing of children, so dominant that it supersedes any such interest the parents may have no matter how well intended.

#### *- PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS*

Private, non-economic organizations, must be supported and encouraged by the new society. Human beings are diverse and have diverse interests and talents; the society should support and encourage the development of every member of the society to the maximum of which he is capable. However, any such organizations that advocate or seek the overthrow of the society’s principles and government, which means a return to minority exploiting rulers, cannot be permitted.

Criticism and alternative opinions are necessary to a healthy society, but action must be pursued through the control and corrective mechanisms provided in the society’s organization – the regular periodic evaluations and their removal from legislative, executive, and managerial positions of incumbents performing unsatisfactorily plus the judiciary’s “inspector general” function.

Private organizations may “lobby” subject to the restrictions presented above.

### *TRANSITIONING TO THE NEW SOCIETY*

#### *- THE PROBLEM AND ITS SOLUTION*

Human society will always be in the form of a mass of the general population effectively dominated and controlled by a

relatively small ruling minority operating the society to their personal benefit and to the disadvantage of the masses unless some methods or techniques can be found to off-set the organizational advantage of the rulers relative to the ruled. Such methods or techniques might be or might include:

- A way to overcome the difficulty of organizing the masses without a new leading elite that will eventually evolve into a new ruling, self-serving minority; or
- A way of nullifying or reducing the organizational advantage of the rulers; or
- Finding, developing, and using an advantage that the masses have over the rulers.

The role of organization in the rulers' conduct of their rule is not organization for organization's sake, but to insure that the rulers function, individually and collectively, with sufficient unity of purpose, plan, methods, and actions to maintain their rule. The rulers must also at least minimally maintain the socio-economic functioning of the ruled masses so that they supply the material and personal needs of the rulers.

That points out one major advantage that the masses have over the rulers: the rulers need the masses but the masses do not need the rulers.

- The rulers cannot exist nor function without the ruled masses. The rulers can do without some of the general populace, even without significant portions of them, and their regularly and consistently doing so gives them power over the masses by instilling fear. The rulers are willing to, and do, render unemployed, starve, imprison, and kill selected individuals and portions of the populace. But, ultimately the rulers must have the services of the bulk of the masses to supply the rulers' needs.



- But, the masses do not need the rulers. There is no function that the rulers provide that the masses must have from them. For the masses doing away with the rulers, all of the rulers, has no disadvantages – it is all positive.

- Some might attempt to claim that the rulers provide skill at governing that the masses would be unable to provide; but, just as presented earlier in the discussion of politicians, the rulers are not better skilled at running a society than other groups, and may well be worse at it because their primary skill is getting into power and keeping themselves in power.

Of course, another major advantage of the masses over the rulers is their numbers. The rulers are enormously outnumbered. Only their organization preserves them against the mis-organized populace.

The key to overcoming the organizational advantage of the rulers is to use these two advantages of the masses, the dependency of the rulers on the masses' services and that the masses greatly outnumber the rulers. That means steadfastly pursuing a two-pronged assault on the very existence of the rulers, pursuing it regardless of sufferings during the course of the struggle, pursuing it steadfastly until complete victory, as follows:

- Depriving the rulers of all material supplies and services – preventing them from functioning, from maintaining their existence – that is, a comprehensive general strike directed at the rulers but maintaining supplies and services for the strikers.

- Removing all rulers from society by whatever means is required among: permanent re-education, permanent effective exile or imprisonment or, when justified, death for war crimes or crimes against humanity.



The requirement is to eliminate, terminate, do away with all rulers, ruler supporters / enablers / facilitators , and all would-be rulers.

- That can be done because the masses have no need of them and the masses greatly outnumber them.
- That must be done because, if not, it is absolutely certain that the rulers will return to power and reinstitute rule by a dominating, abusing, minority.

The rulers must be completely eliminated. It will not suffice to do other than completely eliminate them. If any are left they will pursue resumption of their power. Even after the original rulers have been eliminated it will still remain necessary to subsequently deal with newly appearing persons showing tendencies toward ruler behavior, ruler objectives.

But, that necessity raises another problem: who are the rulers; how are they defined or identified ?

#### *- RULERS VERSUS THE POPULACE*

The distinction between rulers and the general populace is primarily one of attitude toward society. Rulers pursue their personal self interest without regard for the interests of others. They hypocritically claim to care about the interests of the populace and to be acting in the populace' interest, but that is all lies and deception, all hypocrisy. Rulers do and pursue what benefits them and their rule.

Non-rulers are cooperators, team-players, sharers, persons who recognize that they and everyone else will experience a better quality of life through mutual support, sharing and cooperation.

Generally, in evaluating attitude toward society, in identifying and separating rulers and non-rulers, one cannot rely on what they say. Rulers will say anything, whatever they think is required, to maintain their position. Rather, what is important is what they have

done, what they do, how they behave.

In general, in present society, persons in positions of power or authority are “ruler types”. That statement cannot be taken as categorically always valid, but it is useful as an indication. There have been “non-ruler types” who have been in positions of great authority and power; for example George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and the Roman emperor Marcus Aurelius. But one must always be suspicious of persons having power and authority because that very having tends to indicate that they have the “ruler type” attitude and the kind of behavior that is generally essential for the achieving of power and authority.

*- MAKING IT HAPPEN – WHAT IS TO BE DONE*

If the comprehensive general strike against the rulers, the elimination of all rulers, and the establishment of a truly just and responsive government and organization of society are to take place several steps, achievements must first be prepared as follows.

- The general populace must be educated to the program:
  - what it is;
  - why it is necessary;
  - why it is desirable;
  - the nature and security of acting jointly, cooperatively, mutually supportingly.
- An interim constitution and interim initial governments must be prepared:
  - to initially assume the operation and organization of the society;
  - to assure as prompt as possible a transition to a final society in accordance with all of the foregoing principles;
  - to assure, so much as possible, that the organizers of

the transition do not, themselves become another ruling minority.

### CONCLUSION

Paraphrasing the socialist revolutionaries of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century: *People of the world unite and create for yourselves a true, just, democratic society. You have nothing to lose and fulfilling lives to gain.*

### APPENDIX

While not essential to the structure of a just government, it might be desirable for the populace, through their legislatures, to install a limited system of competition in industry and commerce. The reason is that humans are naturally somewhat lazy and will strive harder in socially useful activities if there is potential extra reward.

Capitalism, a system of rampant and largely unrestrained competition, using that principle, has tended to produce a large amount of innovations and improvements to the general benefit of society. That effect has always been particularly true in the early portion of any capitalist enterprise's existence. However, as time progressed, the capitalist drive for maximizing profits has always led to degradation of the products and services produced. But a socialist system of controlled competition could yield the benefits of producing more innovations and improvements without the extremely damaging social and environmental exploitation that characterize capitalism.

Put simply, such a system would establish largely equivalently endowed and supplied duplicate commercial and industrial enterprises, their periodic relative evaluation by whatever applicable populace, and adjustment accordingly of the allocation levels of the workers, staff and executives of the enterprises.

In addition, at the end of each evaluation period, each of the enterprises must be required to completely open full information and data on all of their techniques and methods so that all of the society

benefits from them. That step also places the competitors on an even footing as they enter the next period of innovation and development leading to another evaluation.

## *On Capitalism Versus Socialism*

Wealth acquires power. Power acquires wealth. The wealthy-powerful, that is the power-holding wealthy, enjoy their position of wealth and power and fear losing it.

Therefore, of course, they use their wealth and power to further increase their wealth and power ever more. Therefore, there is a permanent on-going war waged by the powerful and wealthy against the rest of us, taking away from us, the masses, the people, and further enriching them, the wealthy and powerful.

Their principal weapons in that **class war** against us are:

- Keeping the war a secret; preventing the masses of the people from even being aware that the war is being waged against them;
- Bombarding the mass of the people with disinformation and lies so that they believe and act contrary to their own interests; and
- Doing those by their effective control of the media, of the *content*, *position* and *attitude* of television, radio, movies, the printed media, advertising, and *those* as they appear in educational materials and affect schools and the entire education system.

Those wealthy and powerful are the *capitalists* – the eager supporters of the economic - social - political system, *capitalism*, that they have developed and installed to exercise and enhance their position, their wealth and power.

### The Capitalists' Claims

The claims of the capitalists are all lies and disinformation as follows.

- That capitalism promotes freedom.

- It does for them, for the wealthy and powerful, but not for the rest of us whose jobs, income, survival and security depend on the whims and vicissitudes of the capitalist environment forced upon us.

- That capitalism best develops the economy and productiveness.

- Since the advent of capitalism centuries ago the only non-capitalist large scale country ever, the Soviet Union, in 1921, after the end of the autocratic czarist rule and the war against the Russian Revolution by a consortium of 17 European countries and the United States, was far more economically backward than Europe and the United States. Yet, its socialist planned economy grew it to being so much more economically strong by 1941, just 20 years later, that it single-handedly defeated the Nazi hordes' invasion of its territory.

- After that war, having lost 20,000,000 of its people and suffered the complete destruction of the more-developed western part of its country, that socialist planned economy rapidly developed to challenge the United States in all aspects – a United States that lost only a few hundred thousand citizens in World War II, experienced no destruction of its country, its infrastructure, nor its economy, and whose economy robustly developed during the war while the destruction of the population, infrastructure and economy of its socialist competitor was going on.

- After World War II the other new socialist economies, Viet Nam, Korea, China, Cuba, suffered United States blockade and international economic, social, and political undermining, even in some cases outright war and invasion, so that they never had a chance to go about properly developing socialist planned economies. Those not actually invaded were under constant threat of capitalist invasion so that they had to distort their economies toward defense expenditures.

- That capitalism is benevolent.

- How can poverty, unemployment, destruction of families, destruction of the environment, crime, injustice, war, oppression, and corruption be “benevolent” ? Those are all products of capitalism.

• That capitalism is democratic and promotes democracy.

- The capitalists use their wealth and power to force elections to elect their selected supporters of their capitalist system.

- Then they pay and bribe them to pass the laws the capitalists want, the laws they need for controlling and oppressing the mass of us all.

- That is democracy ?

• That they have an inherent “right” to “their” property.

- Their “property” is the factories, the mines, the transportation systems, the utilities, the hospitals – all the institutions on which human society operates. Those were all built with the labor of the masses, not that of the capitalists.

- The capitalists agree, with pride, that their system depends upon greed, selfishness, pursuit of personal gain, competitive survival of the fittest; how could one rationally defend giving “ownership” of the institutions of our society to people as anti-social as that ?

- The only “rights” that the capitalists have are the same as all the rest of us have: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, all to the extent that they do not interfere with those same rights in our fellow persons – the shared rights in a society of shared participation and shared benefits.

• That capitalism is progressive and good for society.

- Corruption and lawlessness are bad for society. They are neither good nor progressive. The principles which the capitalist system operates on include the motivations of: greed, selfishness, competitive pursuit of personal gain without care for any adverse affects on others or on the society in general, and survival of the fittest. Such principles can only lead to corruption and lawless

conduct by those following them – and such corruption and lawlessness are found in capitalist businesses and societies everywhere.

- That a “market economy” works best.

- The capitalists “market economy” is juxtaposed to a planned economy. The market economy invests in facilities in the hope or expectation of a successful market for their product. It develops institutions and works in hope of making a big “killing” and driving other producers out of business.

- A planned economy examines the needs and the resources of the society and then plans investment in facilities and institutions to most effectively develop the society and meet its needs while avoiding waste.

- While always trumpeting their “market economy” to be used in the overall society the capitalists never employ it within their own businesses. Within their businesses they insist on the careful evaluations and planning of a planned economy. Why ? Because the mistakes, inefficiencies and waste of the “market” approach within the capitalists own business, between various departments, divisions, and activities, would drive them out of business.

### The Characteristics of Socialism Compared to Capitalism

>> Compared to what capitalism offers and produces:

- The motivation is greed, selfishness, and personal gain.
- The underlying principle is competitive survival of the fittest:
  - without care for its adverse affects on others,
  - without care for its adverse affects on the society in general.
  - without care for its adverse affects on the environment and our planet.
- The economy operates as a wasteful and inefficient “market economy”.
- The system produces



- crime, corruption, and injustice
  - along with extensive poverty and suffering.
  - The system concentrates wealth in a minute portion of the population.
- >> See the characteristics of socialism:
- The sole motivation is pursuing the general welfare.
  - The underlying principle is cooperation.
  - The economy is a planned economy.
  - The system produces
    - peace and social justice,
    - freedom from war, crime, terrorism, poverty.
  - The system provides socially just sharing of income and wealth:
    - the property of the society is owned by and used for the benefit of all.
    - incomes and benefits are distributed in a fair and equitable manner.
- >> All of which is why the capitalists' class war against the masses of the people, against socialism, must be defeated, must be ended.

## *On Science and Society*

Science on the large scale, that is science dealing with the fundamentals of reality and the universe, has always had and still has a major effect on the non-scientific - social - general philosophic thinking of that science's society and its leaders.

The beginning of the scientific method and the work of scientists such as Copernicus and Galileo resulted in the new period of "The Age of Reason" and "The Enlightenment" – with rationality and empiricism replacing dogma and faith.

The new developments that Newton introduced led directly to the concept of the "clockwork universe" and the strong belief in laws, order and regularity.

And, Einstein's theory of relativity coupled with the 20<sup>th</sup> Century's attribution of actual uncertainty or indeterminism to all physical objects, an extension far beyond the original valid Heisenberg Uncertainty of measurement due to the act of measuring changing the object measured, resulted in our contemporary outlook of a probabilistic reality with no certainty, everything relative and no firm truths.

And, upon Einstein's relativity [and the distortion of Heisenberg uncertainty], we can lay some of the responsibility for the horrors and tragedies of the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> Centuries.

How is that so ?

---

The point of view that the questions, "What is truth ?" and "What is real ?" are meaningless questions without answers is not only incorrect but quite negative and harmful in that it suppresses inquiry and progress that could otherwise take place.

Truth is that which conforms to and describes reality. Reality is that which is, not only matter and energy in their various forms but also: feelings and emotions, ideas and cultures, languages and arts, and so forth.

The problem of truth has beset mankind since the earliest stages of the development of our reasoning. It has resulted in a more or less collective decision to grant equal validity to a number of different versions of the truth in spite of their being mutually contradictory.

Not that individuals, organizations and governments hold the opinion that their own version of the truth is not correct. Rather, they ardently believe in the correctness of their own views. But, their inability to prove their views and their inability to defeat differing or opposing views necessitates their getting along in some fashion with those other views and the multiplicity of contradictory views of reality.

That state of affairs has existed for so many human lifetimes that it has essentially implanted in our collective and individual thinking the incorrect belief that there is no absolute truth, that truth is what we say it is -- especially that truth is what we can enforce it to be.

We have gone from inability to determine the truth to non-belief in its existence and then to belief that truth, and reality, are whatever we choose to believe them to be and can force on our fellows.

The most significant characteristic of the 20th Century, other than its explosion of technology, has been its adoption of the attitude

that truth is different for each person and each case, that it is what each individual perceives it to be -- that there is no objective reality, only the subjective reality as perceived by each individual -- that all is relative.

The great damage that such thinking does is the license that it gives. It gives license to create, choose, decide upon one's own "reality" and then act accordingly. Such thinking ultimately gives us war, rapine, holocausts, genocide.

But, if there is an absolute reality, objective truth, then, even if we are not able to completely know and understand it, we are subject to it. We are measured and judged by it; we experience the effects and consequences of it whether we agree and approve or not, and we feel compelled to behave accordingly.

*Thus absolute reality and objective truth,  
which indeed exist,  
also are desirable and beneficial.*

*They are, in fact, essential to civilized society.*

In the paper [The Einstein – Lorentz Dispute Revisited](http://www.The-Origin.org/9808052.pdf)<sup>1</sup> it is shown, based upon new data not available to Einstein, that Einstein's comprehensive relativity and denial of an absolute frame of reference for the universe are incorrect and that the universe has an absolute universal prime frame of reference.

*And thus objective reality, essential to civilized society, but  
denied for a century through the error in Einstein's science and  
opinion,  
is now restored.*

---

1 – <http://www.The-Origin.org/9808052.pdf>

## 11

### *On Education*

The youth of a society are that society in the future. Their correct education is essential to the functioning and survival of the society. Therefore, in planning and designing that education it is important to first make clear its purposes and objectives.

#### *THE PURPOSES OR OBJECTIVES OF EDUCATION*

There are three general immediate purposes or objectives of education and one further long term one. These are as follows.

- 1 - To train or form the individual to be a cooperative, contributing, sharing, rational, responsible, social member of the society, a process that is sometimes termed “civilizing”.
- 2 - Based upon his aptitudes and interests, to teach the individual one or more skills or specialties as needed to be usefully practiced for the functioning of the society and needed by the individual for him to socially contribute to the society.
- 3 - To equip each individual to be able to pursue within the society the achievement of as high a quality of life and fulfillment of his potential as is possible for him.
- 4 - To identify and further develop those individuals having the requisite intelligence and talents to be leaders in the society in its progressive further development, its adaptations to changing circumstances, and its creative avoidance of stagnation on the one hand and excessive revolution on the other.

The order of relative priority of those objectives is as given above.

The first objective is the most fundamental and essential because without successful “civilizing” of the members of the society it cannot exist nor function as a society; rather, it would devolve into primitive survival of the fittest behavior.

That first condition having been met, then the society requires the successful accomplishment of the second objective, the provision and production of those services and products essential to the functioning of the society and of its individual members.

The third objective is the actual overall objective of the society and would be of the first priority except that the fulfilling of the first and second objectives is an essential prerequisite to pursuing the third.

The fourth objective is, of course, long term but essential.

### *CONTROL AND DIRECTING OF THAT EDUCATION*

Education being of such great importance to the society, the control, directing and performing of that education cannot be left to amateurs, nor to random chance, nor to personal preferences and prejudices of individual parents and teachers. It is the society itself, because of the above objectives and their relative priorities, that must control and direct the education of its youth, of each successive generation.

Much of the education for the first objective, and the laying of the groundwork for the remaining objectives, takes place in the first years of children’s lives, years in which the child experiences primarily the nuclear family environment and learns from both the overt teaching by its parents and the actual behavioral examples that they provide. Because those early years are such significant formative years in the development of a child the role of parent is extremely important in the education of children.

Consequently, the role of parent cannot be deemed an absolute right of adult persons, especially not for them to conduct as they personally see fit; rather, it is a function so crucial to the society that it must be controlled and directed by the society through trained, experienced professionals, not the amateur parents that most parents are or would be absent intervention by the society.

Children are not the property of their parents; they are not possessions. They are not the property of anyone, neither their parents nor the society. No matter how strong the bonds connecting parents and their children, emotional bonds and biological bonds, and no matter how perfect the intentions of parents with regard to their children, it remains that parents are little or poorly trained and naturally inexperienced for their role as parents. On the other hand, the society has a dominantly greater interest than the parents in the proper educating of its children.

Consequently, parenting must be a privilege, open only to those who demonstrate their abilities [either their inherent abilities or those obtained after appropriate training] to provide the kind and quality of early years education necessary for the proper advantageous development of the child and the success of the society. Inasmuch as the love and bonding between parents and their children is valuable and desirable for the early development of the child yet those parents must also be sufficiently qualified for their parenting role, the actual process of procreating children must be restricted to those persons meeting the requirements of sound parenthood after appropriate training to teach and prepare them for parenthood and testing to evaluate their readiness.

Even after such a program designed to provide, by training and selection, that all parenting is performed at the optimum for the child and the society, continuous monitoring of all actual parenting going on is called for to insure maintenance of the requisite level of parenting and education.



Millennia ago farmers learned that of the crops that they harvested the portion to be set aside for seeding the next season's crop should be that portion of the highest quality, the remainder being for consumption. That way the quality of each successive crop should be better than its predecessor. That same principle is applicable to education. The members of society who are the teachers and the education system managers and planners, in general the educators, should come from the highest quality [for those purposes] members of the society. Similarly, in the society the position of educator should be highly respected and well economically compensated. On that principle the quality of the adult members of the society produced by the education system should improve generation upon generation.

### *ANSWERING THE CRITICS AND SKEPTICS*

Critics and skeptics will complain about interference with adult's "freedom" to do as they wish, in particular to procreate children and to raise them as they see fit. But, that "freedom" serves only the particular interests of the particular adults so protesting. That "freedom" does not necessarily serve the interests of their neighbors, nor those of the society in general, and especially not the interests of the child.

The society owes its adults, freely, every opportunity to learn to be socially beneficial parents for the sake of their offspring and for the overall sake of the society. But it owes the society in general and especially its children an optimal education and it has the obligation to prevent incompetent or harmful parenting from taking place.

Others will raise objections to the society determining the content of education: that which will be positively taught, that which will be included / omitted, and that which will be negatively depicted. These same critics do not criticize in that manner the society's functions of: law making, business practices, international treaties, war making, decisions on roads, zoning, other public facilities, public safety, health care, and so forth. That is, they take it for granted that



the governmental system of the society performs those functions sufficiently well. And they believe that to the extent that it does not do so a change in the persons running the government will be enforced.

Certainly then, that same procedure, what is good enough for public safety and health care, applied to determining the content of education and the standards for educators and for parents, should be as acceptable for those educational functions as for all the other functions of government.

But, in the case of education an even better procedure can be used.

Government is run by politicians. The qualifications of politicians generally fail to include skill or expertise in governing nor in any of the various aspects of running and managing a society. The skill and expertise of politicians is primarily in getting themselves elected and re-elected. To some extent that involves their conduct and decisions being designed to please the voters, but to a much greater extent that involves their pleasing those persons with wealth and power who contribute the money that makes or breaks the politicians' election campaigns and who reward the politicians with gifts and benefits.

The setting of standards and determination of content for the education functions must be set, not by politicians, but by skilled, experienced, trained education specialists. Politics must be kept out of education.

Likewise, personal economic gain and profit seeking must be kept out of education. The best test of whether an activity or proposal is objectively directed toward performing the intended or stated function is asking, "Who benefits?"

- The unqualified parent who objects to these requirements is seeking his personal benefit, not that

of his children nor that of the society.

- The politician who seeks to control the educators or the content of education is seeking his own benefit in the implementing of his personal objectives, not that which benefits the society as a whole.

## *On Determinism and Free Will*

### *CAUSES AND EFFECTS*

Observation and experience tell us that everything, every event, is caused. Furthermore, those causes themselves are things and events caused by precedent things and events and so *ad infinitum* back until the beginning, the origin. That array - network of causes and effects is a solid chain back into the past and, therefore, just as solidly a causal chain into the future.

Therefore everything is already determined, is pre-determined. The future is as fixed and unalterable as is the past.

### *DETERMINISM*

We can mentally conceive of all of space in all of its grand extension outward from where we, ourselves, are. We can do that even though we, ourselves, are located at only a minute portion of that totality of space and could never even visit or examine all of it.

That totality of space exists and it does so without our ever experiencing or participating in other than a small local portion of it. We can at any instant be only at one place in the totality of space.

Now mentally conceive of all of time in all of its grand extension forward and rearward from where we, ourselves, are. We can do that even though we, ourselves, are located at only a minute portion of that totality of all time and can never even visit or examine all of it.

That totality of time exists because of the unbreakable chain of causality creating and

uniting it and it does so without our ever experiencing or participating in other than a small local portion of it. We can be only at one moment at a time in the totality of time.

Then, just as every place is, so every event is. Even as viewed from our current place or moment in time everything has effectively happened. All is already determined.

### *FREE WILL*

The problem with Determinism would appear to be that only one course of action is really open to a person; that a person cannot be morally responsible for his acts because he cannot freely choose; that reward and punishment are meaningless. However, that is not so.

Although everything is already determined we nevertheless seem to have free will. We feel that we have choices and can freely select from among them. It seems to us that we are free, not pre-determined. And it seems to us that reward and punishment are significantly effective in influencing the choices that we make. That all takes place as follows.

If society and my environment tell me that I will be punished and exiled from human society for being criminal and that I will be rewarded and granted participation in human society for being honest and responsible, clearly being so told will tend to influence my behavior away from the criminal and toward the honest and responsible.

If I then decide [seemingly to me as a free decision] to be honest and responsible and so act then it is that behavior of mine that was pre-determined by the “solid chain” of causes and effects even as if it had already happened, which in a sense is actually the case.

If I nevertheless decide [seemingly to me as a free decision] to be criminal and so act then it is that behavior of mine that was, likewise, so pre-determined even as if it had already happened, which

in a sense is actually the case.

I seem to make the choice and to do so influenced to some extent by the promised punishment and reward.

However, the choice I make is pre-determined even though it does not seem that way to me. Before I make it at my then current location in time I have already made it somewhat later along the stream of my existence in time.

## *On Being and Non-Being, Life and Death*

Mankind and all sentient life have an innate fear of death. The reason for that is Darwinian Evolution. Past species that did not assiduously avoid death had a greater tendency for their members to die individually in the incessant competition and struggle for survival, and that led to their specie dying out. Our human specie is an evolved successor to earlier species all having evolved a strong aversion to death.

That being the case, intelligent species use their intelligence to speculate on death, its causes, how to avoid death, where death leads, etc. And, death being innately fearsome as all species have evolved to feel, intelligent species invariably deny death by postulating that life goes on after death, albeit in a different context.

And, they adopt that belief in spite of there being absolutely no evidence to support it and a large amount of significant evidence contradicting it. The only reason for mankind's belief in life after death is the urgent need to deny that which is so feared -- personal death.

The contradicting evidence includes:

- The evidence of the human remains and their condition in every grave, entombment, and mausoleum as time after death progresses;
- The absence of any report back from persons who have died;
- The unresolvable after-life complexity of people who lived sequentially, that is successively in time, existing simultaneously.
- The biological evidence of all other life species

from plants to chimpanzees.

- The problem of the infinite boredom of aware existence forever;
- That infinity itself is impossible;
- And, whereas life after death would require acts or intervention by a god or some supernatural entity, *The Origin and Its Meaning* <http://www.The-Origin.org> has shown that both the universe and intelligence are the result of natural actions, neither using nor depending on a god or supernatural entity, which do not exist and never did.

People behave that way, so believing in life after death, because for each individual its own death is too fearsome to accept. They so believe in spite of that their so believing creates continuous fear, anxiety, and concern during their life over how their death will work out, whether favorably or badly.

On the other hand, numerous philosophers and writers have concluded in comparing having life with being dead, that is comparing being with non-being or existence with non-existence, that non-being, being dead, is far to be preferred. For example:

- In his *Apologia* Plato presents Socrates embracing his coming end and giving his several well thought out and intended reasons;
- Sophocles wrote, "... Thy portion esteem I highest, Who wast not ever begot ...";
- Voltaire said, "We like life, but all the same nothingness also has its good points."
- Schopenhauer states, "... it remains at least doubtful whether existence is to be preferred to non-existence ... [and] ... if experience and reflection have their say, non-existence must

surely win.”

Others saying the same include such as:

- the author(s) of the biblical book “Job” and the author(s) of the biblical book “Ecclesiastes”
- Bede the Venerable, Pascal, Hume, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Freud, Santayana, etc.

There are a number of reasons in support of that conclusion all based on our condition of awareness in the state of non-existence, which state is also the case when we become dead after having been alive. In non-existence there is no pain, no suffering, no frustration, no disappointment, and so forth. Furthermore, in non-existing we have no awareness and, therefore, no feeling of actually not-being, no feeling of something lost, or missed. As the Christian rites of burial propose it is a state of “eternal rest” and “eternal peace”.

What more could one ask for than eternal rest, eternal peace, eternal absence of pain and suffering, with eternal non-awareness of any “living” missed, anything at all missed ?

We all know from experience that life assuredly has a lot of pain, suffering, frustration, disappointment and so on. All of the major religions view life as a painful, unpleasant testing ground, a “vail of tears”. We choose to bear all of that only because of our innate fear of death.

True, we also know from experience that life may have, and perhaps occasionally actually delivers: joy, happiness, feeling of accomplishment and so forth. But, no matter how much and how fully those are experienced in life, upon entering death and non-being those experiences become meaningless to the deceased who has no awareness of them.

And, if one is to enjoy “being remembered” for things of his life, the enjoyment of that can only be in the anticipation before death of the appreciation looked for to be received after death, for once dead



there is no experience of it at all.

Therefore, death, that is the ending of life, or even better life or personal existence never having been, never having begun, is overwhelmingly to be preferred. Non-existence provides everything that could be wished for.

Never having existed is not available to us but entering into permanent non-existence is readily available. Death is not to be feared. Rather it is to be eagerly embraced.

Of course, there are those who believe in a life after death choosing to so believe in spite of the absence of any evidence whatsoever because they have not rationally thought out the reasoning presented above. Those believers condemn themselves not only to a lifetime of fear and anxiety over how their death will work out but also to a continuous dreadful fear of dying.

Regardless, we are all guaranteed to some time die, to some time receive the release of death and its eternal peace. Then, those of us having sufficient courage and curiosity choose to embrace life while it is thrust upon us in spite of all of the negative aspects. Life is a once-only chance to experience what there is to be experienced before becoming nothing, which it is certain we will get to experience. Not only that, but death is within our power to have whenever we would wish if the experiencing of life should become too adverse.

Therefore, one should live without fear of death, living life to the maximum as long as one can put up with its adversities; and one should embrace death when one chooses its release or when it comes on its own.

## *Epilogue*

### *The Meaning, The “Point” Of It All*

The meaning, the import, the significance – the “point” of one’s life, and for that matter the “point” of everyone’s life and of all life collectively, and even of the universe all have two aspects:

- [1] In the “long run” looking back when everything is over with, finished, “completed” or not, and
- [2] In the “short run”, that is one’s own life, one’s own being, here, now.

#### *IN THE “LONG RUN”*

It is of no importance. No one will be there to note anything, not “how it all turned out” nor what is thought of us then. Not only that; all civilizations, all accomplishments, all planets, all stars the entire universe will have died, decayed and dispersed to the point of being essentially nothing, that from which it all came.

#### *AH – BUT IN THE “SHORT RUN”*

The meaning, the import, the significance, the “point” of it all is precisely whatever we make of it. It is within our power – completely under our control – because it depends entirely on what we think, what our “attitude” is, and the energy, strength and determination we bring to them.

One could choose a life focused on *possessions*, on their acquisition, amassing, and consumption even though that choice results in never being satisfied, never having enough, and continually fearing losing that which one has acquired. Such a life is one of taking, not giving. It is not a creative life. It is a life forgotten and dismissed in the end.

Or, one could choose a life focused on *perfections*, on their development and employment to the benefit of others and for one’s

own satisfaction. And, that choice results in being fulfilled and at peace with oneself as compared to a life focused on possessions with its constant need and apprehension. It is the choice of perfections which requires energy, strength and determination, and that is the choice of the sharing, contributing and creative person.

The life of amassing possessions can have no meaning other than that that person exists only for himself and, therefore is of no objective value to anyone else, is of no value at all.

For one's own life to have meaning it must have sharing, contributing and creating. And, that is the "point" of it all.

\* \* \*

## *SECTIONS INDEX OF KEY WORDS*

### Section 1 – The Philosophic Principles of Rational Being

page 1 -  
ideas and concepts  
material [reality]  
philosophic basis of being and life  
reality

page 2 -  
objective [reality]  
subjective [reality]

page 3 -  
doubt  
judgment  
objective [truth]  
subjective [truth]  
truth

page 4 -  
empirical, physical knowledge  
knowledge  
metaphysical knowledge

page 5 -  
assumptions  
causality or mechanism  
rational

page 6 –  
body of validated knowledge

page 7 –  
goodness [the good]  
needs  
wants

page 8 -  
civilization  
justice

- page 9 –
  - criminal
- page 10 -
  - absolute and conditional goods
  - internal and external goods
- page 11 –
  - means and ends
- page 12 –
  - ethics
  - morality
  - pursuit of happiness
  - right conduct
  - virtue
- page 13 -
  - criminal
  - why be virtuous
- page 14 -
  - capitalism
  - socialism
  - virtue and societies
- page 15 -
  - beauty, the beautiful
- page 16 -
  - art, artist,
- page 17 -
  - greatest good, *summum bonum*
  - happiness
  - love
- page 18 -
  - social love

## Section 2 – The Problem of Absolute Truth

- page 20 –
  - absolute truth

determining the truth about reality

### Section 3 – The Problem of Absolute Reality

page 23 –

conservation

infinity

nothing

objective reality

one postulate needed

starting at the beginning

page 24 –

efficient cause

origin of the universe

page 25 –

Aristotle

formal and material cause

page 26 -

Plato

page 27 –

duration

why the origin happened

### Section 4 – The Problem of Our Biological Heritage

page 30 –

change

competition

survival

understand our nature

page 31 –

uses of intelligence

page 32 -

attempts to alter human nature

government

page 33 –

religion  
page 34 -  
communism  
socialism  
page 35 –  
the problem of our laziness

## Section 5 – The Problem of Our Society – Political Economy

page 37 –  
economics  
political economy  
page 38 -  
investing in capital tools and equipment  
labor  
productive potential  
“real economics”  
page 39 –  
macro-economics  
micro-economics  
provision for future needs  
page 40 –  
economic pyramid  
political economy  
unemployment  
page 41 –  
social cost  
page 42 -  
“do you know of anything better?”  
page 43 –  
benefit of few at expense of many

## Section 6 – What is Civilization ?

page 44 –  
civilization

cooperation  
purpose of civilization  
“rugged independence”

## Section 7 – The Evolution to Civilization

page 46 –  
    objective truth  
    objective reality  
    society of social love  
    why social love essential  
page 48 –  
    why social love possible  
page 49 –  
    prisoners’ dilemma  
page 50 –  
    progressive development not radical change  
page 51 -  
    progress so far  
    the method  
page 52 –  
    advance by generations  
    evolution to a humane society  
page 53 -  
    how social love can be achieved  
page 54 –  
    the import, the message

## Section 8 – On Democracy and the Governmental Organization of Society

page 56 –  
    abuse of power  
    problems of government and society  
page 57 -  
    politicians



page 58 –  
    democracy

page 59 –  
    economic socialism  
    general principles of a new organization of government

page 61 –  
    representative democracy  
    restricted personal wealth

page 62 –  
    voting after the fact, not electing

page 63 -  
    government executives  
    income related to social performance

page 64 –  
    expert advice and specialists

page 65 –  
    money and medium of exchange

page 67 –  
    an example constitution  
    government

page 72 –  
    industry and commerce

page 73 –  
    transparency

page 74 -  
    secrecy

page 75 –  
    “lobbying”

page 77 –  
    freedom

page 78 –  
    religion

page 79 -

- private organizations
- transitioning to the new society
- page 82 –
  - rulers versus the populace
- page 84 –
  - Conclusion
  - controlled competition

## Section 9 – On Capitalism versus Socialism

- page 86 –
  - capitalist's claims
  - class war
  - power
  - wealth
- page 89 –
  - characteristics of socialism

## Section 10 – On Science and Society

- page 91 –
  - Einstein
  - Heisenberg
  - science on the large scale
  - scientific method
  - tragedies of the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries
  - uncertainty
  - relativity
- page 92 -
  - reality
  - truth
- page 93 –
  - license that it gives
  - objective reality restored
  - that all is relative
  - war, rapine, holocausts, genocide

## Section 11 – On Education

- page 94 –
  - purposes of objectives of education
- page 95 –
  - control and directing of education
- page 96 -
  - role of parent
- page 97 –
  - critics and skeptics
  - quality of educators

## Section 12 – On Determinism and Free Will

- page 100 –
  - causal chain
  - determinism
- page 101 -
  - free will

## Section 13 – On Being and Non-Being, Life and Death

- page 103 –
  - evidence
  - fear of death
  - postulate that life goes on after death
- page 104 –
  - what past philosophers say
- page 105
  - reasons in support of non-being
- page 106 –
  - death ultimately inevitable

## GENERAL INDEX

### A

absolute and conditional goods, 10  
absolute truth, 20  
abuse of power, 56  
an example constitution, 67  
Aristotle, 25  
art, artist,, 16  
assumptions, 5  
attempts to alter human nature, 32

### B

beauty, the beautiful, 15  
benefit of few at expense of many, 43  
body of validated knowledge, 6

### C

capitalism, 14  
capitalist's claims, 86  
causal chain, 100  
causality or mechanism, 5  
change, 30  
characteristics of socialism, 89  
civilization, 8, 44  
class war, 86  
communism, 34  
competition, 30  
Conclusion, 84  
conservation, 23  
control and directing of education, 95  
controlled competition, 84  
cooperation, 44  
criminal, 9, 13  
critics and skeptics , 97

### D

death ultimately inevitable, 106  
democracy, 58  
determining the truth about reality, 20  
determinism, 100  
doubt, 3  
“do you know of anything better?”,  
42  
duration, 27  
advance by generations, 52

### E

economic pyramid, 40  
economic socialism, 59  
economics, 37  
efficient cause, 24  
Einstein, 91  
empirical, physical knowledge, 4  
ethics, 12  
evidence, 103  
evolution to a humane society, 52  
expert advice and specialists, 64

### F

fear of death, 103  
formal and material cause, 25  
free will, 101  
freedom, 77

### G

general principles of a new  
organization of government, 59  
goodness [the good], 7  
government executives, 63

government, 32, 67  
greatest good, *summum bonum*, 17

## H

happiness, 17  
Heisenberg, 91  
how social love can be achieved, 53

## I

ideas and concepts, 1  
income related to social performance,  
63  
industry and commerce, 72  
infinity, 23  
internal and external goods, 10  
investing in capital tools  
and equipment, 38

## J

judgment, 3  
justice, 8

## K

knowledge, 4

## L

labor, 38  
license that it gives, 93  
“lobbying”, 75  
love, 17

## M

macro-economics, 39  
material reality, 1  
means and ends, 11

metaphysical knowledge, 4  
micro-economics, 38  
money and medium of exchange, 65  
morality, 12

## N

needs, 7  
nothing, 23

## O

objective reality, 2, 23, 46  
objective truth, 3, 46  
objective reality restored, 93  
one postulate needed, 23  
origin of the universe, 24

## P

philosophic basis of being and life, 1  
Plato, 26  
political economy, 37, 40  
politicians, 57  
postulate that life goes on after death,  
103  
power, 86  
prisoners’ dilemma, 49  
private organizations, 79  
problems of government and society,  
56  
productive potential, 38  
progress so far, 51  
progressive development not radical  
change, 50  
provision for future needs, 39  
purpose of civilization, 44  
purposes of objectives of education,  
94  
pursuit of happiness, 12

## Q

quality of educators, 97

## R

rational, 5  
“real economics”, 38  
reality, 1, 92  
reasons in support of non-being, 105  
relativity, 91  
religion, 33, 78  
representative democracy, 61  
restricted personal wealth, 61  
right conduct, 12  
role of parent, 96  
“rugged independence”, 44  
rulers versus the populace, 82

## S

science on the large scale, 91  
scientific method, 91  
secrecy, 74  
social cost, 41  
social love, 18  
socialism, 14, 34  
society of social love 46  
starting at the beginning, 23  
subjective reality, 2  
subjective truth, 3  
survival, 30

## T

that all is relative, 93  
the import, the message, 54  
the method, 51  
the problem of our laziness, 35  
tragedies of the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup>  
centuries, 91  
transitioning to the new society, 79  
transparency, 73  
truth, 2, 92

## U

uncertainty, 91  
understanding our nature, 30  
unemployment, 40  
uses of intelligence, 31

## V

virtue and societies, 14  
virtue, 12  
voting after the fact, not electing, 62

## W

wants, 7  
war, rapine, holocausts, genocide, 93  
wealth, 86  
what past philosophers say, 104  
why be virtuous, 13  
why social love essential, 46  
why social love possible, 48  
why the origin happened, 27,